HD
243
.W8
0947
1979

SUPPLEMENT TO

WYOMING Land Use Decisions



Determinations of Unsuitability
for Coal Development

Overland Area - Rawlins District



BLM LIBRARY
88081629

LIBRARY
SIF CODE
COPY
OF

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

#1551319783 ID: 88681629

May 1, 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WSO LIBRARY
HD
243
.W8
0947
1979

CHAPTER 1

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION ---------- 1

UPDATED PLAN ---------- 6

SUMMARY RESULTS ---------- 8

CHAPTER 2

APPLICATION OF THE UNSUITABILITY CRITERIA ---------- 9

CHAPTER 3

IMPACT OF THE UNSUITABILITY DETERMINATION ---------- 74

APPENDIX 1

PUBLIC COMMENTS ---------- 89

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 85, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 85, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225

May 1, 1979

REVISIONS TO THE OVERLAND MFP LAND USE DECISIONS

CHAPTER 1

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This document is a draft planning supplement to the Overland Management Framework Plan (MFP). The land use planning decisions contained herein are proposed decisions that would not become final or adopted until after 1) the Secretary of the Interior has made a decision on the coal unsuitability criteria used in preparing this supplement; and 2) an opportunity for public hearing, if requested by any person(s) who will or may be adversely affected by one or more of the proposed decisions, if adopted, has been provided. Also, should the Secretary decide to change any of the coal unsuitability criteria, the proposed decisions are subject to change accordingly, before they would be made final and adopted.

This planning supplement revises the multiple use decisions specifically addressing coal development in the Red Rim-China Butte area. The original decisions under which the coal program for this area is currently managed are a part of the 1977 Management Framework Plan (MFP) for the Overland Planning Unit. Map 1-1 shows the original MFP decisions for the planning unit.

Revisions to MFP coal decisions reflect new information and are consistent with recent statutory requirements that affect coal development on federal lands. The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976 requires preparation of land use plans as a basis for allocation of resources on public lands. The Federal Coal Leasing Amendments Act (FCLAA) of 1976 requires that any coal leasing be based on a comprehensive land use plan or land use analysis. The Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA) of 1977 commits the Secretary of the Interior to specific planning requirements. Specifically section 522(b) of SMCRA directs the Secretary to conduct a review of federal lands to determine whether classes of federal lands should be designated unsuitable for surface coal mining operations or adverse surface effects of underground coal mining.

A principal part of the process for implementing the requirements of the federal land review mandated by SMCRA involves applying 24 interim coal unsuitability criteria to known recoverable coal resource areas. These criteria, developed by the Secretary, address resource considerations such as wilderness areas, scenic areas, natural and historic values, wildlife species and habitat, water resources, flood plains, alluvial valley floors, and prime farmlands. See Table 1-1 for a listing of the unsuitability criteria.

The revisions reflect both the application of the coal unsuitability criteria and other multiple use considerations. Chapter 2 contains the specific findings (narrative and maps) related to application of the criteria.

This planning supplement pertains only to the 40,700 acres of public land in the Red Rim-China Butte area (Map 1-2) of the Overland Planning Unit. Coal unsuitability criteria will be applied to the remaining known recoverable coal resource areas (KRCRA) within the planning unit no later than fiscal year 1982, at which time the Overland MFP is scheduled for revision. This specific area was selected for review because of its coal resource potential and because it had been identified for potential coal development in the 1977 MFP. Manpower and budgetary

TABLE 1-1

Unsuitability Criteria*

1. Federal land systems, i.e., National Park System, National Wildlife Refuge System, National System of Trails, and the like.
2. Rights-of-way and easements.
3. Buffer zones along rights-of-way and adjacent to communities and buildings.
4. Wilderness study areas.
5. Scenic areas.
6. Lands used for scientific studies.
7. Historic lands and sites.
8. Natural areas.
9. Federally listed threatened and endangered species.
10. State listed endangered species.
11. Bald and golden eagle nests.
12. Bald and golden eagle roost and concentration areas.
13. Falcon cliff nesting sites.
14. High interest migratory birds.
15. High interest state resident fish and wildlife.
16. Wetlands.
17. Floodplains.
18. Municipal watersheds.
19. National resource waters.
20. State lands unsuitable (not available at this time).
21. State proposed criteria (not available at this time).
22. Prime farmlands.
23. Alluvial valley floors.
24. Reclaimability.

*Complete statements of the criteria and exceptions are contained in Chapter 2.

RED RIM / CHINA BUTTE



Map 1-1
ORIGINAL MFP DECISION

Areas For Leasing Subject to Environmental Statement



restraints prevent review of the remaining (KRCRA) within the planning unit at this time. Within the Red Rim-China Butte area, this planning supplement identifies areas unsuitable for further consideration for coal development as well as areas acceptable for further consideration should the Secretary decide to proceed with a federal coal leasing program. These determinations are the first step in a process which may lead to formal designations, by the Office of Surface Mining (OSM), of certain areas as unsuitable for either surface or underground coal mining due to their adverse surface affects. No specific sites (tracts) for coal development have been, or will be, identified in this planning supplement. Identification and delineation of tracts would occur only after adoption of a federal coal management program and a Secretarial decision to proceed with new federal coal leasing.

Area Description

The Red Rim-China Butte area (Map 1-2) is bordered by Interstate 80 on the north, beginning approximately 10 miles west of Rawlins and extending southwesterly in a belt some 5 miles wide through 20 miles of checkerboard land pattern. As shown on Map 1-2, private and federal land and coal ownerships exist on an alternating section basis.

Topography varies from the steep bluffs of Red Rim on the eastern border to the rolling hills and flat bottom lands in the western and southern portions. Three perennial streams traverse the unit running in a westerly to northwesterly direction. Predominant vegetation consists of a grass-sagebrush type with some greasewood and saltbush. Significant wildlife habitat values include critical winter range for antelope, sage grouse nesting and strutting areas, and cliff nesting sites for raptors and eagles. Pronghorn antelope, mule deer, and sage grouse are the principal game species.

The Red Rim-China Butte area contains an estimated reserve of 230 million tons of federal coal. The coal contains more than 8,000 BTUs per pound, and sulfur content averages less than 2 percent.

Original Coal Planning Decision for the Red Rim-China Butte Area

The 1977 multiple use decision for coal development in the Red Rim-China Butte area (Map 1-1) was to lease all the federal coal subject to findings of an environmental assessment. The rationale for leasing under this multiple use decision was as follows:

- -The minability and high quality of the coal resources
- -Apparent demand and marketability
- -Relative potential for rehabilitation
- -The predicted lesser long-term environmental impacts as compared to other coal resource areas
- -The potential for independent mining of intermingled private sections, thereby creating adverse bypass situations

RED RIM / CHINA BUTTE



Map 1-2
LAND SURFACE AND COAL OWNERSHIP

Private and State Surface or Coal

Federal Surface or Coal



Revision Summary

Based upon coal unsuitability criteria and multiple use considerations, this revision identifies unsuitable areas, and those areas which are acceptable, for further consideration for coal development (see Map 1-5). The rationale for these determinations is explained in detail in the Updated Plan section of this chapter.

Definitions of Area Classifications

The multiple use decisions included in this planning supplement appear in the Updated Plan section. The decisions are based on designations, defined as follows:

1. Unsuitable for further consideration for coal development based on unsuitability criteria. Unsuitable areas are governed by one or more of the unsuitability criteria and are not amenable to criteria exceptions.

2. Unacceptable for further consideration for coal development based on multiple use considerations. Unacceptable areas are exempted from coal development due to multiple-use resource considerations.

3. Acceptable for further consideration for coal development. Acceptable areas are broken down as follows:
   a. Acceptable with no likely problems--defined as areas acceptable for further consideration for coal development, which were not excluded by application of unsuitablity criteria or multiple use considerations.

   b. Acceptable pending further study--defined as areas where known values exist but where their relationship to the unsuitability criteria cannot be defined without further specific information.

   c. Acceptable with inventory needs--defined as areas where inventory data relative to the unsuitability criteria is lacking.

Process

Incorporation of unsuitability criteria and development of the revised plan consisted of four discrete steps.

1. Unsuitability criteria, without exceptions, were applied to federal coal, regardless of surface ownership, availability of the coal, or coal development potential (Map 1-3).*
   *Instructions from Washington directed applying the criteria only to coal areas with high and moderate development potential. Since the coal data was incomplete, it was decided to apply the criteria regardless of coal development potential. As more data becomes available, geographic application of the criteria will be refined.

2. Multiple use values were considered to determine whether areas were acceptable or unacceptable for further consideration for coal development (Maps 1-3, 1-5).

3. On areas which were determined unsuitable by criteria, and acceptable by multiple use, further assessment was done through application of the criteria exceptions (Map 1-4).

4. Proposed Management Framework Plan decisions were then developed and summarized in a brochure for public comment (Map 1-5). The decisions were framed in the following terms.
   1) Unsuitable (by criteria) for further consideration for coal development.
   2) Unacceptable (by multiple-use) for further consideration for coal development.
   3) Acceptable for further consideration for coal development. This category contains three subcategories which are defined in the above section of this chapter.

   Although this planning process was applied to all federal coal, no decisions were made where there was an existing federal coal lease. The criteria will be applied to existing leases, for which there is no pending or existing mining and reclamation plan, at such time as a plan is submitted.

Public Participation and Agency Coordination

Certain of the criteria required coordination, consultation, or concurrence with other federal and state agencies. Contacts were initiated in December 1978 and are continuing.*

*As of April 4, 1979 not all required consultation or concurrence has been achieved. Where specific actions are pending, they are discussed in Chapter 2. Final decisions will reflect all requirements of consultation, coordination, and concurrence.

A draft summary brochure of proposed MFP decisions was distributed to the public for review and comment on February 23, 1979. A public meeting and open house were held on March 14, 1979, to receive oral and written statements. Prior to and after the public meeting, one-on-one meetings were held with various interested coal companies, land owners and county officials.

The public (governmental agencies, organizations, and industry) expressed concern over the short time frame for their participation in the process. Most of the public comment has been critical of this exercise. The Governor of Wyoming has questioned the adequacy of the inventory data, the level of consultation with the state, and the application of the criteria. Industry has challenged the total process with respect to their involvement, economic considerations, and multiple use priorities (i.e., coal versus other resource values). The Sierra Club has questioned the legality of the process, the Wyoming Outdoor Council is concerned with over-application of the exceptions, and land or surface owners are concerned with the impact of the federal determinations on adjacent private lands.

Appendix 1 contains letters, comments, and the attendance lists and transcript of the public meeting. Public comments and response, where they relate to specific criteria, are contained in Chapter 2.

RED RIM / CHINA BUTTE



Map 1-3
UNSUITABILITY CRITERIA (Without Exceptions) AND MULTIPLE USE DETERMINATIONS

- Unsuitable By Criteria
- Unacceptable By Multiple Use
- Linear Rights-of-Way (Unsuitable)

RED RIM / CHINA BUTTE



Map 1-4
CRITERIA EXCEPTIONS DETERMINATIONS

- Exceptions Not Applied (MU Conflicts)
- Areas Remaining Unsuitable
- Acceptable Pending Study
- Acceptable With Inventory Needs
- Acceptable With No Likley Problems



UPDATED OVERLAND PLAN

The revisions to the original multiple use decisions for coal development are shown on Map 1-5 and are listed below with rationale to support the proposal. Acceptable areas may be further considered for coal development.

Multiple Use Decision

1. Areas identified on Map 1-5 as acceptable pending study and acceptable with inventory needs, are available for further consideration for coal development. Acceptable areas would be subject to the following, if it is determined by the Secretary that new federal coal leasing is necessary.

   a. Tract delineation, ranking, and selection.

   b. Findings of an environmental assessment.

   c. Further study in buffer zones around areas identified as unsuitable.

   d. Inventory for endangered species and other wildlife considerations.

   e. Locating railroad spur lines, haul roads, buildings, and other facilities in a manner that would create a minimum conflict with the areas identified unsuitable.

   f. Demonstration that reclamation is possible to a degree necessary to restore disturbed areas to a productive state for wildlife and for livestock.

   g. An effective air and water pollution abatement program that would assure compliance with applicable state and federal quality standards.

Rationale

With increased coal production, the nation could draw closer to energy self-sufficiency. A shift from petroleum to coal for electrical generation would free petroleum reserves for transportation needs. The coal in the acceptable areas could assist the nation in becoming less dependent upon foreign energy resources.

The acceptable areas contain over 227 million tons of economically recoverable and marketable coal with high or moderate development potential. The coal could be mined from these areas in such a manner that the impacts could be mitigated. The areas are also in close proximity to an existing railroad and power sources.

The acceptable areas lie within a checkerboard land and coal ownership pattern. The private minerals on every other section are controlled by Rocky Mountain Energy Company. It is highly probable that the private coal will be mined, even without the intermingled federal sections. To mine the private coal and leave the federal coal would be inefficient use of the energy resources. Logically mining federal coal in conjuction with private

coal would be more efficient and would restrict land disturbance and environmental impacts to smaller areas for shorter time periods.

2. Do not allow coal development in those areas identified on Map 1-5 as unsuitable by the criteria.

Chapter 3 contains an analysis on the effects of excluding areas based on application of the unsuitability criteria.

Portions of the areas identified as unsuitable could become acceptable if underground mining were the main method proposed for coal extraction. Also, portions of the areas identified as acceptable pending study could become acceptable with no likely problems, if it can be demonstrated on similar areas that the wildlife species of concern would not be adversely affected and that productive wildlife habitat can be successfully restored.

Rationale

The following areas were found unsuitable after application of the unsuitability criteria and exceptions.

a. A 100-foot wide buffer zone extending south from Interstate 80 (unsuitability criterion 3).

b. A stream gaging station on Separation Creek (unsuitability criterion 6).

c. The Overland Trail and Washakie Stage Station and approximately a 1/8-mile buffer zone (unsuitability criterion 7).

d. Two Golden Eagle nesting sites and a buffer zone of 1/4 mile radius. One nest is located near Muddy Creek and the other on Red Rim (unsuitability criterion 11).

e. Muddy Creek (unsuitability criterion 16).

f. Portions of Muddy Creek, Fillmore Creek and Separation Creek (unsuitability criterion 17).

g. A portion of Separation Creek (unsuitability criterion 23).

3. Do not allow coal development in those areas identified on Map 1-5 as unacceptable because of multiple use conflicts.

Rationale

a. For protection of the historic values, exclude the Overland Trail and Washakie Stage Station, including a 1/8-mile buffer zone.

b. Exclude the following cliff areas for protection of raptor nesting habitat:

T. 21 N., R. 89 W., Section 36: NW¼
T. 20 N., R. 89 W., Section 4: SE¼
T. 20 N., R. 89 W., Section 8: SE¼
T. 17 N., R. 91 W., Section 8: N½
T. 19 N., R. 90 W., Section 4: SE¼SE¼

c. For protection of water quality and wildlife habitat exclude Separation Creek, Fillmore Creek, Muddy Creek and a buffer zone of approximately 1/4 mile on each side of the creeks, including the public water reserves.

d. Exclude the lands between the Union Pacific Railroad and Interstate 80 to minimize hazards to vehicle traffic on the highway from blowing dust and to reduce the adverse visual impact. This buffer zone would also serve to mitigate air quality problems that could occur along the highway.

SUMMARY RESULTS

The summary results of the application of the coal unsuitability criteria and multiple use considerations are shown in Table 1-2.

Table 1-2 (Map 1-5)

Red Rim/China Butte Review Area

	Acres	% of Total Acres	Tons	% of Total Coal Reserves
Unsuitable by Criteria	646	2	3,662,174	2
Unacceptable by Multiple Use	6,740	17	38,209,060	17
Acceptable by Criteria	40,054	98	227,066,126	98

RED RIM / CHINA BUTTE



Map 1-5
REVISED MULTIPLE USE DECISIONS

- Unsuitable By Criteria
- Unacceptable By Multiple Use
- Unsuitable By Criteria and Unacceptable By Multiple Use
- Acceptable Pending Study
- Acceptable With Inventory Needs

CHAPTER 2

APPLICATION OF THE UNSUITABILITY CRITERIA--RED RIM-CHINA BUTTE REVIEW AREA

This chapter includes narratives and maps which show the results of applying the unsuitability criteria. The following narratives for each criterion address the unsuitability determinations, data sources, and application of the exceptions. The associated maps are located at the end of this chapter. They include individual maps for applicable criteria and maps showing coal resource occurrence and coal development potential.

1. FEDERAL LAND SYSTEMS

CRITERION

All federal lands included in the following land systems or categories and an appropriate buffer zone, if necessary, as determined by the land management agency, shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining: National Park System, National Wildlife Refuge System, National System of Trails, National Wilderness Preservation System, National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, National Recreation Areas, and other Federally purchased recreation lands, Custer National Forest, and Federal lands in incorporated cities, towns, and villages. All Federal lands which are recommended for inclusion in such systems or categories by the Administration in legislative proposals submitted to the Congress or which are required by statute to be studied for inclusion in such systems or categories shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,700	230,728,300

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

Land status maps and Master Title Plats were checked to determine if any of the items in the criterion were applicable. None of the items stated were found.

Findings

None of the items stated in the criterion were found in the area.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Data sources were land status maps and Master Title Plats. These sources are considered to be current and are the best data sources available.

Unsuitability Determination

All of the review area is considered to be acceptable with no likely problems. This encompasses 40,700 acres of federal land and 230,728,300 tons of federal coal.

EXCEPTION

A lease may be issued for underground coal mining within the Custer National Forest with the consent of the Department of Agriculture.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,700	230,728,300

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

Not applicable.

Findings

Not applicable.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

The exception does not apply.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments were received relative to application of this criteria.

2. Rights-of-Way and Easements (Map 2-1)

CRITERION

Federal lands that are within rights-of-way and easements and within surface leases for residential, commercial, industrial, public purposes, and agricultural crop production on federally-owned surface shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	195	1,105,455
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,505	229,622,845

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

Rights-of-way for powerlines, telephone lines, pipelines, railroads and water improvements were considered. These were located using the Master Title Plat and then plotted on USGS 7½ and 15 minute quadrangle maps and overlays.

Findings

The above rights-of-way are considered unsuitable for coal development.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Master Title Plat, Historical Index, and USGS 7½ minute quadrangle maps. The data was considered up-to-date and reliable.

Unsuitability Determinations

All the lands identified on Map 2-1 as being within rights-of-way and surface leases are considered unsuitable for coal development.

EXCEPTIONS

A lease may include such areas if the land management agency determines that:

1. Coal development (e.g., underground mining) will not interfere with the purpose of the right-of-way or easement, or

2. The right-of-way or easement was granted for mining purposes, or

3. The right-of-way or easement was issued for a purpose for which it is not being used, or

4. The parties involved in the right-of-way or easement agree to leasing, or

5. It is impractical to exclude such areas due to the location of coal and method of mining and such areas can be protected through use of appropriate stipulations.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,700	230,728,300

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

If areas are leased, the roads, railroads, powerlines, telephone lines, and pipelines could be relocated to facilitate coal development. In many cases, these rights-of-way were granted for mining purposes. Special land use permits and mineral material sites are revocable at any time upon notice and at the discretion of the authorized officer of the Bureau of Land Management, if it is determined the land should be devoted to another use.

Findings

All unsuitable areas under this criterion became acceptable with no likely problems after application of the exceptions.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

BLM's Master Title Plat.

Unsuitability Determinations

The final result after application of this criterion and the exceptions is that all the public lands identified as being within rights-of-way and surface leases are determined to be acceptable with no likely problems.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments were received relative to application of this criterion.

3. Buffer Zones Along Rights-of-Way and Adjacent to Communities and Buildings (Map 2-1)

CRITERION

Federal lands affected by section 522(c) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining. This includes land within 100' outside of the right-of-way of a public highway or within 100' of a cemetery, and within 300' of an occupied building, school, church, community or institutional building or public park or within 300' of an occupied dwelling.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	46	260,774
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,654	230,467,526

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The above criterion was applied using the Master Title Plat and USGS 7½ and 15 minute quadrangle maps.

Findings

The only public right-of-way is Interstate 80. There are no public cemeteries, schools, churches, community or institutional buildings, or public parks on public lands (surface and/or mineral estate).

Data Sources and Quality of Data

BLM's Master Title Plat, Historical Index and USGS 7½ and 15 minute quadrangle maps.

Unsuitability Determinations

The land within 100' outside of the public highway right-of-way for Interstate 80, consisting of approximately 46 acres of public land, is considered unsuitable for coal development.

EXCEPTIONS

A lease may include mine access roads or haulage roads that join the right-of-way for a public road. Additionally, the Surface Mining Regulatory Authority may issue a permit to have public roads relocated. Finally, owners of occupied buildings may give permission to mine near the buildings.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	46	260,774
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,654	230,467,526

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

In most cases, public highways could be relocated with permission from the State, however, relocation of Interstate 80 was not considered feasible in this case.

Findings

The land within 100' of Interstate 80 (approximately 46 acres) remains unsuitable.

Data Source and Quality of Data

BLM's Master Title Plat and USGS 7½ and 15 minute quadrangle maps. The existing data was considered adequate for this purpose.

Unsuitability Determinations

The final result after application of this criterion and the exceptions is that all of the review area is determined to be acceptable with no likely problems, except for a 100' buffer zone south of the right-of-way for Interstate 80 (approximately 46 acres), which is determined to be unsuitable.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments were received relative to application of this criterion.

4. Wilderness Study Areas

CRITERION

Federal lands designated as wilderness study areas shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining while under review by the Administration and the Congress for possible wilderness designation. For any federal land which is to be leased or mined prior to completion of the wilderness inventory by the land management agency, the environmental impact statement (or analysis) of the lease sale or mine plan must consider whether the land possesses the characteristics of a wilderness study area. If the finding is affirmative, the land shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,700	230,728,300

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

Available information in the wilderness inventory was utilized to make the judgement.

Findings

There are no designated wilderness or wilderness study areas in the Red Rim-China Butte area, and because of the checkerboard land ownership pattern, no possibility exists for such areas. As a result, the entire area is considered acceptable with no likely problems.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

The staff of the Rawlins District BLM conducted a wilderness inventory during the winter of 1978-79. The quality of the data is believed to be completely adequate.

Unsuitability Determinations

No areas were determined to be unsuitable.

EXCEPTION

Issuance of noncompetitive coal leases and mining on leases may proceed if authorized by the Wilderness Act and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,700	230,728,300

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

Not applicable.

Findings

Not applicable.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

No areas were determined to be unsuitable.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments were received relative to application of this criterion since there were no wilderness values within the Red Rim-China Butte review area.

5. Scenic Areas

CRITERION

Scenic federal lands designated by visual resource management analysis as Class I or II (areas of outstanding scenic quality and/or high visual sensitivity) but not currently on the National Register of Natural Landmarks shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,700	230,728,300

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

Visual resource management (VRM) overlays were examined to determine if any Class I or Class II areas lie within the boundaries of the review area.

Findings

No Class I or Class II scenic areas are found in the area. Therefore, the entire area is determined to be acceptable with no likely problems.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Rawlins District BLM personnel prepared VRM overlays in the summer of 1978. The quality of available data was considered to be adequate.

Unsuitability Determinations

No areas were determined to be unsuitable.

EXCEPTION

A lease may be issued if the land management agency determines that coal mining will not significantly diminish or adversely affect the scenic quality of the designated area.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,700	230,728,300

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

Not applicable.

Findings

Not applicable.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

No areas within the review area were found to be unsuitable.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments were received relative to application of this criterion.

6. Lands Used for Scientific Studies (Map 2-2)

CRITERION

Federal lands under permit by the land management agency, and being used, for scientific studies involving food and fiber production, natural resources or technology demonstrations and experiments shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	10	56,690
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,690	230,671,610

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

This criterion was applied as written. No supplemental guidance or deviations were used.

Findings

Two scientific study plots are located on public lands within the Red Rim-China Butte area. An Energy Mineral Rehabilitation Inventory and Analysis (EMRIA) study plot is located in T. 19 N., R. 90 W., Section 4, NE¼NE¼. This study was finished on November 4, 1976.

A stream gauging station is located on Separation Creek, T. 20 N., R. 90 W., Section 32, NE¼SE¼SW¼. This station is under permit to USGS and is being used.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Master Title Plats
Surface Water Resources Map
Personal Communication--BLM Area Manager

Unsuitability Determinations

The USGS stream gauging station located at T. 20 N., R. 90 W., Section 32, NE¼SE¼SW¼ is determined to be unsuitable.

EXCEPTIONS

A lease may be issued:

1. With the concurrence of the principal scientific user or agency, or

6. Lands Used for Scientific Studies (May 1/1)

CRITERION

Federal lands under permit by the land management agency, and being used, for scientific studies involving food and fiber production, natural resources or technology demonstrations and experiments shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Acres	Federal Coal Tons*
Unsuitable	10	32,500
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	60,000	210,471,810

*Assuming an average of 3500 tons/acre.

7 ocess

This criterion was applied as written. No supplemental guidance or deviations were made.

Findings

Two scientific study plots are located on public lands within the Red Rim-Chica Basin area. An Energy Mineral Rehabilitation Inventory and Analysis (EMRIA) study plot is located on T. 19 S., R. 99 W., Section 9, 6th PM. This study was finished on November 9, 1976.

A stream gauging station is located on Separation Creek, T. 20 S., R. 99 W., Section 12, 6th PM. This station is under permit to USGS and is being used.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Master Title Plats
Surface Water Resources Map
Personal Communication--BLM Area Manager

Uncertainty Determinations

The USGS stream gauging station located at T. 20 S., R. 99 W., Section 22, 6th PM is determined to be uncertain.

EXCEPTIONS

A lease may be issued:

1. With the concurrence of the principal scientific user or agency, or

2. Where the mining could be done in such a way as not to jeopardize the purpose of the study as determined by the land management agency.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	10	56,690
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,690	230,671,610

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The exceptions were not applied because the area determined unsuitable was also determined unacceptable by multiple use.

Findings

None.

Data Source and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

The USGS stream gauging station located at T. 20 N., R. 90 W., Section 32, NE¼SE¼SW¼ (10 acres) is determined to be unsuitable.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comments were received relative to application of this criterion.

7. Historic Lands and Sites (Map 1-5)

CRITERION

All districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of historic, architectural, archeological, or cultural significance which are included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places, and an appropriate buffer zone around the outside boundary of the property (to protect the inherent values of the property that made it eligible for listing in the National Register) as determined by the land management agency, in consultation with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation or by procedures approved by the Advisory Council, shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	620	3,514,780
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	40,080	227,213,520
--with no likely problems	-0-	-0-

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The criterion was applied to existing data collected in 1976.

Findings

Approximately 35 sites were located. Approximately 22 of these sites require additional work (mapping and test excavations) to determine eligibility for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places.

One site, the Overland Trail, has been evaluated as eligible for nomination to the National Register. It encompasses 600 acres of federal lands located in the NE¼, NW¼, SW¼, Section 2, S½, Section 4, SW¼, Section 6, and the N½, Section 8, T. 17 N., R. 91 W.

Another site, the Washakie Stage Station, is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and encompasses 20 acres of federal lands located in the N½, Section 6, T. 17 N., R. 91 W.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

The report referenced below provides the data for the inventoried areas. The consultant who prepared the report holds an Antiquities Permit for work on BLM-administered lands in Wyoming. However, the report has obvious discrepancies in number of sites discovered,

numbers of sites needing further work, and National Register sites. Therefore, the overall accuracy of the data are somewhat questionable without further verification.

Metcalf, M., Ed.
1977 An archeologist Sampling Survey of the Sweetwater-Kemmerer and Hanna-Atlantic Rim Coal ES areas. Western Wyoming College, Occasional Papers 10.

Unsuitability Determinations

Under this criterion, 620 acres of federal lands and 3,514,780 tons of federal coal are determined to be unsuitable. Another 40,080 acres of federal lands and 227,213,520 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable with inventory needs.

EXCEPTIONS

Leasing may be allowed if the land management agency determines:

1. The site, structure, or object is of regional or local significance only with the concurrence of the State, or

2. In consultation with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the direct and indirect effects of coal mining to properties on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places will not result in significant adverse impacts to the site, structure, or object.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal	
	Acres	Tons
Unsuitable	620	3,514,780
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	40,080	227,213,520
--with no likely problems	-0-	-0-

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The exceptions were considered based on the available cultural resource inventory data and on evaluation results. Site specific surveys and consultation with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation will be conducted if necessary during activity planning efforts.

Findings

Based on available cultural resource inventory data and evaluation results, it was determined that coal mining could not be conducted without adversely impacting the quality of or destroying the Overland Trail or the Washakie Station sites. Therefore, the exceptions cannot be applied.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

The following report provides the data for the inventoried areas. The consultant who prepared the report holds an Antiquities Permit for work on BLM-administered lands in Wyoming. However, the report has obvious discrepancies in number of sites discovered, numbers of sites needing further work, and National Register sites. Therefore, the overall accuracy of the data are somewhat questionable without further verification.

Metcalf, M., Ed.
1977 An archeologist Sampling Survey of the Sweetwater-Kemmerer and Hanna-Atlantic Rim Coal ES areas. Western Wyoming College, Occasional Papers 10.

Unsuitability Determinations

Under this criterion, 620 acres of federal lands and 3,514,780 tons of federal coal are determined to be unsuitable. Another 40,080 acres of federal lands and 227,213,520 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable with inventory needs.

Note: An individual map, showing the results of applying this criterion, was inadvertently omitted from this draft MFP Supplement. The areas affected are those at the southernmost end of the review area that are identified on Map 15 as being unsuitable by criteria and unacceptable by multiple use.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Comments from Rocky Mountain Energy Company (RME) questioned the need for a ½ mile buffer for the Overland Trail and Washakie Stage Station. The buffer was reconsidered and it was determined that a 1/8 mile buffer was adequate.

The Wyoming Recreation Commission indicated they would await future site specific statements before recommending cultural clearance.

8. Natural Areas

CRITERION

Federal lands designated as natural areas or as National Natural Landmarks shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,700	230,728,300

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

Existing lists of the above classified areas were examined.

Findings

No areas which would fit the above natural area classification are found in the review area. The entire area is determined to be acceptable with no likely problems.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

The Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service has determined that there are no natural areas or National Natural Landmarks within the Red Rim-China Butte area. The quality of the available data was considered to be adequate.

Unsuitability Determinations

No unsuitable areas were found.

EXCEPTIONS

Leasing may be allowed in these areas or sites if the land management agency determines that:

1. The area or site is only of regional or local significance only with the concurrence of the State, or

2. The use of appropriate mining technology will result in no significant adverse impact to the area or site, or

3. The mining of the coal resource will enhance information recovery (e.g., paleontological sites).

8. Natural Areas

CRITERION

Federal lands designated as natural areas or as National Natural Landmarks shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Acres	Federal Coal Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development--		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	60,700	230,728,300

*Assuming an average of 3800 tons/acre.

Process

Existing lists of the above classified areas were examined.

Findings

No areas which would fit the above natural area classification are found in the review area. The entire area is determined to be acceptable with no likely problems.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

The Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service has determined that there are no natural areas or National Natural Landmarks within the Red Rim-Circle Butte area. The quality of the available data was considered to be adequate.

Unsuitability Determinations

No unsuitable areas were found.

EXCEPTIONS

Leasing may be allowed in these areas or sites if the land management agency determines that:

1. The area or site is only of regional or local significance only with the concurrence of the State, or

2. The use of appropriate mining technology will result in no significant adverse impact to the area or site, or

3. The mining of the coal resource will enhance interpretive recovery (e.g., paleontological sites).

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,700	230,728,300

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

Not applicable.

Findings

Not applicable.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

No areas were found to be unsuitable.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments were received relative to application of this criterion.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal	
	Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development.		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,700	230,178,300

*Assuming an average of 5800 tons/acre.

Process

Not applicable.

Findings

Not applicable.

Data Source and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

No areas were found to be unsuitable

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments were received relative to application of this criterion.

9. Federally Listed Endangered Species (Map 2-3)

CRITERION

Legally designated critical habitat for Federal threatened/endangered (T/E) plant and animal species, and habitat for Federal T/E species which is determined by the Fish and Wildlife Service and the land management agency to be of essential value and where the presence of T/E species has been scientifically documented, shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	14,400	81,633,600
--with no likely problems	26,300	149,094,700

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The criterion was applied with existing data and inventories.

Findings

A black-footed ferret (Mustela nigripes) survey was conducted on the Red Rim area in September 1978. No evidence of ferret activity was found on the site. Thus, the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) concluded that the area could be mined without affecting this endangered species.

There are presently no available data on the occurence of white-tailed prairie dog towns or black-footed ferrets in the southern 1/3 of the review area (China Butte site). Thus, further study is needed to determine the presence or absence of this endangered animal and its potential and/or essential habitat.

Although the Red Rim area is within the American peregrine falcon (Falco peregrinus anatum) and the bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) range, it is unlikely that either species would inhabit the area because suitable habitat is lacking. In addition, 1978 surveys of the area revealed no evidence of these species. Thus, it is believed that the area does not include any critical or essential habitat for either of these species.

An endangered plant survey was conducted by BLM on the review area in 1977. No threatened or endangered plants were found in the area.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

The BLM contracted the FWS to conduct a black-footed ferret survey on the Red Rim site in 1978. The quality of the data is adequate when considering the present inventory technology. Data are lacking on both white-tailed prairie dogs and black-footed ferrets on the China Butte site. However, a survey will be conducted by the FWS on this site during the 1979 field season.

The endangered plant survey conducted by the BLM is believed to be adequate to determine if the area supports any endangered plants.

Unsuitability Determinations

Under this criterion, 26,300 acres of federal land and 149,094,700 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable with no likely problems. The remaining 14,400 acres of federal land and 81,633,600 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable with inventory needs.

EXCEPTIONS

Leasing may be allowed if, after consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service, the land management agency determines the species habitat will not be adversely affected by coal development.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	14,400	81,918,576
--with no likely problems	26,300	149,089,177

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The exception was not applied since there was no need to do so on the areas surveyed by the Fish and Wildlife Service and no data to apply it to in the unsurveyed area.

Findings

The acreages and tonnages are determined to be the same as in the criterion findings.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Data Source and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

Under this criterion, 25,700 acres of federal land and 169,084,700 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable with no likely problems. The remaining 14,400 acres of federal land and 81,633,300 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable with inventory needs.

EXCEPTIONS

Leasing may be allowed if, after consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service, the land management agency determines the species habitat will not be adversely affected by coal development.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal	
	Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	14,400	81,918,378
--with no likely problems	25,700	169,089,177

*Assuming an average of 5800 tons/acre.

Process

The exception was not applied since there was no need to do so as the areas surveyed by the Fish and Wildlife Service had no data to apply it to in the unsurveyed area.

Findings

The acreages and tonnages are determined to be the same as in the criterion findings.

Data Source and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

Under this criterion, there are 26,300 acres of federal land and 149,094,700 tons of federal coal determined to be acceptable with no likely problems. The remaining 14,400 acres of federal land and 81,633,600 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable with inventory needs.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No comments were received on the specific results of applying this criterion on the review area.*

*Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is not complete on the China Butte site.

10. State Listed Endangered Species

CRITERION

Habitats deemed critical or essential for plants and animal species listed by the State pursuant to State law as endangered or threatened shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable		
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study		
--with inventory needs		
--with no likely problems		

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The State of Wyoming presently has no law regarding threatened and endangered plants or animals. Therefore, the criterion has not been applied.

Findings

Not applicable.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

Not applicable.

EXCEPTIONS

A lease may be issued if, after consultation with the State, the land management agency determines that the species will not be adversely affected by the coal development.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable		
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study		
--with inventory needs		
--with no likely problems		

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

10. State Listed Endangered Species

CRITERION

Habitats deemed critical or essential for plants and animal species listed by the State pursuant to State law as endangered or threatened shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Type*
Unsuitable		
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study		
--with inventory needs		
--with no likely problems		

*Assuming an average of 5000 tons/acre.

Process

The State of Wyoming presently has no law regarding threatened and endangered plants or animals. Therefore, the criterion has not been applied.

Findings

Not applicable.

Data Source and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

Not applicable.

EXCEPTIONS

A lease may be issued if, after consulting with the State, the land management agency determines that the species will not be adversely affected by the coal development.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Type*
Unsuitable		
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study		
--with inventory needs		
--with no likely problems		

*Assuming an average of 5000 tons/acre.

Process

Not applicable.

Findings

Not applicable

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

The criterion has not been applied.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No specific comments were received.

11. Bald and Golden Eagle Nests (Map 2-4)

CRITERION

Bald and golden eagle nests that are determined to be active and a buffer zone of land in a ¼-mile radius from the nests are areas which shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining, except that, during the non-breeding season, mining can be conducted within the buffer zone. Consideration of availability of habitat for prey species shall be included in the determination of buffer zones.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	150	850,350
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	1,750	9,920,750
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	38,800	219,957,200

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

This criterion was applied with existing data on nesting raptors inventoried on the coal area. A nest was determined to be active if there were observations of bird use or if signs indicated the nest was used during some phase of the reproduction process during the 1978 nesting season. The buffer zone of up to 1 mile was determined from current Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) enforcement of the Bald Eagle Protection Act.

Findings

Two active golden eagle nests were found on this site in 1978. Thus, the federal lands inside a radius of ¼ mile were determined to be unsuitable for coal development. The federal lands between the ¼-mile to 1-mile radius were determined to be acceptable pending study to determine the size of buffer needed to protect the nests from human disturbance during the nesting season.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

A raptor nesting survey of the coal area was conducted by the BLM Rawlins District during the summer of 1978. The quality of the data is believed adequate to determine the nesting species, activity, and location.

Unsuitability Determinations

The 150 acres of federal lands within ¼ mile of the nests are determined to be unsuitable. The 1,750 acres of federal lands within a ¼ to 1-mile radius of the nests are determined to be acceptable pending study. The remaining 38,800 acres are determined to be acceptable with no likely problems.

EXCEPTIONS

A lease may be issued if:

1. It can be conditioned in such a way, and during periods of time, that eagles will not be disturbed during breeding season, or

2. A permit or special approval is granted by the Fish and Wildlife Service to allow the eagle nest to be moved.

Buffer zones may be increased or decreased if the land management agency determines that the active eagle nests will not be adversely affected.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	150	850,350
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	1,750	9,920,750
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	38,800	219,957,200

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The exceptions were considered based on a literature review of golden eagle nesting behavior and on the specific study area.

Findings

1. It was the judgement of the BLM biologists that the federal lands within the unsuitable area cannot be mined in such a way or during any period of time that the nesting eagles would not be disturbed.

2. There are presently no provisions granted by the Fish and Wildlife Service which would allow for the movement of a golden eagle nest.

The buffer zones for the unsuitable (¼ mile) and acceptable pending study (out to 1 mile) areas will remain as determined until field examination and literature review can be conducted to justify any changes.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

The BLM conducted a raptor nesting inventory on the review area in 1978. The following sources were used to determine if the exception could be applied.

BLM Technical Note 239. Habitat Management Series for Unique or Endangered Species. Report No. 7. Golden Eagle.

Personal Communication. Mayo Call, Ph.D., Avian Biologist, BLM, Denver Service Center.

Unsuitability Determinations

Within the review area, 150 federal acres (850,350 tons of federal coal) are determined to be unsuitable. Another 1,750 federal acres (9,920,750 tons of federal coal) are determined to be acceptable pending study. The remaining 38,800 federal acres and 219,957,200 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable with no likely problems.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Rocky Mountain Energy Company (RME) disagreed with the findings under this criterion because one nest site was on private land. Their comments also indicated disagreement with application of the exceptions. Specifically, they questioned why BLM determined that mining could not be allowed within the buffer zone during the non-breeding season and why BLM had not contacted the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding the feasibility of moving the nest.*

*The nest site is on private land, however, the unsuitable and acceptable pending study determinations on the federal land are within the one mile buffer zone.

Applying the exceptions did not change the site from unsuitable to acceptable because it was determined that the eagles would be disturbed by the mining activity. Also the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service does not presently have provisions for moving golden eagle nests.

The Wyoming Game and Fish Departments' comments indicated that eagle nesting sites probably cannot be mitigated through either reclamation or habitat improvement, but creating nesting sites or moving nests may be possible.

12. Bald and Golden Eagle Roost and Concentration Areas (Map 2-4)

CRITERION

Bald and golden eagle roost and concentration areas used during migration and wintering shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	40,700	230,728,300
--with no likely problems	-0-	-0-

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The criterion was not applied at this time because inventory data on golden eagle use of the area is lacking.

A roost or concentration area is defined as an area that is used by at least 5 to 10 eagles per square mile of aquatic or upland area and is used for a minimum of two weeks during the course of the winter.

Findings

The area was determined to be acceptable with inventory needs because of insufficient data on which to apply the criterion. Up to 17 golden eagles were observed during aerial transects taken during the winter of 1978-79. Observations for the migration periods and more years of data collection are needed before a determination can be made.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Eagle observations were made during the nine aerial surveys of the area conducted during the winter of 1978-79. The data are only adequate to estimate minimum bird use, since not all birds are readily observable and flight lines are 1 to 3 miles wide.

Unsuitability Determinations

The entire 40,700 acres of federal lands and 230,728,300 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable with inventory needs.

EXCEPTION

A lease may be issued if the land management agency determines that mining can be conducted in such a way, and during such periods of time, to ensure that eagles will not be adversely disturbed.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	40,700	230,728,300
--with no likely problems	-0-	-0-

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The exception cannot be applied because inventory data are lacking.

Findings

Not applicable.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

The entire 40,700 acres of federal lands and 230,728,300 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable with inventory needs.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No specific public comment was received relative to this criterion.

13. Falcon Cliff Nesting Sites (Map 2-5)

CRITERION

Federal lands containing falcon cliff nesting sites with active nests and a buffer zone of Federal lands ¼-mile radius from the nest to provide needed prey shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining, except that, during the non-breeding season, mining can be conducted within the buffer zone. Consideration of availability of habitat for prey species shall be included in the determination of buffer zones.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	5,239	29,699,891
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	35,461	201,028,409

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The criterion was applied with existing data collected during the 1978 nesting season. A nest was determined to be active if adults and fledglings were observed on the nest site. All other observations of nesting sites that were not conclusive were determined to be probable. All species of the family Falconidae were included in the application of the criterion.

Findings

Active nesting sites were determined to be acceptable pending study, until a list of specific falcon species to be protected is developed. It is our understanding that the criterion definitions did not intend to include common species such as the American kestral. Also, to be consistent with the eagle criterion and Fish and Wildlife Service enforcement policy, a 1-mile radius buffer zone around both active and probable nest sites was determined to be acceptable pending study.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

The Red Rim-China Butte area was inventoried by the BLM Rawlins District staff during the 1978 nesting season. These data are of sufficient quality to determine the active and probable nest sites in the area for that year. However, further study of the probable sites is needed to either verify or dismiss nesting use beyond 1978.

Unsuitability Determinations

Under this criterion, 5,239 acres of federal lands and 29,699,891 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable pending study. The remaining 35,461 acres and 201,028,409 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable with no likely problems.

EXCEPTIONS

A lease may be issued if:

1. The land management agency determines that coal mining will not adversely impact the nesting sites during the breeding season, or

2. Nest sites may be moved with concurrence of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Buffer zones may be increased or decreased if the land management agency determines the active falcon nests will not be adversely affected.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	5,239	29,699,891
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	35,461	201,028,409

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The exceptions were not applied, since no lands were determined to be unsuitable.

Findings

Not applicable.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

Under this criterion, 5,239 acres of federal lands and 29,699,891 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable pending study. The remaining 35,461 acres of federal lands and 201,028,409 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable with no likely problems.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Concern was expressed that the criterion does not differentiate between rare or very common falcon species. The Wyoming Game and Fish Department indicated that unsuitable determinations within a ¼-mile radius of American kestral nests is unreasonable. The initial unsuitable determinations were revised to be included in the acceptable pending study category.

The Wyoming Game and Fish Department also indicated that falcon nesting sites probably cannot be mitigated through either reclamation or habitat improvement, but creating nesting sites or moving nests may be possible.

14. Migratory Birds (Map 2-6)

CRITERION

Federal lands which are high priority habitat for migratory bird species of high Federal interest on a regional or national basis, as determined jointly by the Federal land management agency and the Fish and Wildlife Service, shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	15,287	86,662,003
--with inventory needs	3,455	19,586,395
--with no likely problems	21,958	124,479,902

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

At this time, the criterion has been applied without input from the Fish and Wildlife Service to jointly determine the species of high federal interest on a regional or national basis. The BLM biologists compiled a list of species that are expected to be on that joint list. The following species were determined to be of high federal interest by the BLM:

buteo hawks (e.g., ferruginous, red-tailed)
accipter hawks
harriers
owls
wading birds
migratory game birds
shorebirds
species listed on the blue list (sensitive species)

The high priority habitats were determined by the BLM biologists to be active nesting habitats and wetlands.

An active raptor nest was considered to be a nest where adults and/or young were observed or where there were signs of bird activity resulting from nesting behavior during the 1978 breeding season. All other nests were considered to be inactive for that nesting season. However, study is needed to determine if the nests were active within the last 5 years.

It is anticipated that when coordination with the FWS is completed, buffer zones will be similar to those applied in criteria 11 and 13, namely an area of ¼-mile radius will be determined to be unsuitable around active raptor nests, and from ¼ to 1-mile radius will be determined to be acceptable pending study.

May 1, 1975

16. Migratory Birds (Map 25)

CRITERION

Federal lands which are high priority habitat for migratory bird species of high Federal interest as a regional or national basis, as determined jointly by the Federal land management agency and the Fish and Wildlife Service, shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Acres	Federal Coal Tons*
Unsuitable		
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	15,287	86,682,003
--with inventory needs	3,455	19,586,795
--with no likely problems	21,758	124,479,902

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

At this time, the criterion has been applied without input from the Fish and Wildlife Service to jointly determine the species of high federal interest on a regional or national basis. The BLM biologists compiled a list of species that are expected to be on that joint list. The following species were determined to be of high federal interest by the BLM:

bureo hawks (e.g., ferruginous, red-tailed)
accipter hawks
harriers
owls
wading birds
migratory game birds
shorebirds
species listed on the blue list (sensitive species)

The high priority habitats were determined by the BLM biologists to be active nesting habitats and wetlands.

An active raptor nest was considered to be a nest where adults and/or young were observed or where there were signs of bird activity resulting from nesting behavior during the 1975 breeding season. All other nests were considered to be inactive for that nesting season. However, study is needed to determine if the nests were active within the last 5 years.

It is anticipated that when coordination with the FWS is completed, buffer zones will be similar to those applied in Montana (1/2 and 1/3, namely an area of ½-mile radius will be determined to be unsuitable around active raptor nests, and from ½ to 1 mile radius will be determined to be acceptable pending study).

Nesting habitat for shorebirds and wading birds which would need to be inventoried would be those areas that are classified as wetlands and floodplains, and existing stockwater improvements.

Findings

All federal lands within a 1-mile radius of those raptor nests known to be active in the 1978 nesting season were determined to be acceptable pending study, until the joint list can be formulated. The federal lands within a 1-mile radius around those nests determined to be inactive during the 1978 nesting season were determined to be acceptable pending study.

The areas classified as floodplains and wetlands (including impoundments) are determined to be acceptable with inventory needs to identify the nesting habitat for the shorebirds and wading birds.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

The Rawlins District BLM conducted a raptor nesting survey of the Red Rim-China Butte area during the 1978 nesting season. The survey is believed to be of adequate quality to determine nest use (active, inactive), species of bird, and nest location.

Data are lacking on the shorebirds, wading birds, and other species of high federal interest.

Unsuitability Determinations

No federal lands or federal coal were determined to be unsuitable for the protection of raptor nesting sites. Since the joint list has not been formulated, a total of 15,287 acres of federal lands and 86,662,003 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable pending study to identify needed buffer zones around known active and inactive (1978) raptor nests. Pending completion of a finalized list with the FWS, there are 3,455 acres of federal land and 19,586,395 tons of federal coal determined to be acceptable with inventory needs to determine nesting habitat of shore and wading birds. The remaining 21,958 acres and 124,479,902 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable with no likely problems.

EXCEPTION

A lease may be issued where the land management agency, after consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service, determines that coal mining will not adversely impact the migratory bird habitat during periods when such habitat is used by the species.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	15,287	86,662,003
--with inventory needs	3,455	19,586,395
--with no likely problems	21,958	124,479,902

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

Coordination of application of this criterion with the FWS has not been completed.

Findings

Site-specific and species-specific analyses need to be completed to determine whether sizes of buffer areas may be changed.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Literature used in determining the ability to apply the exception are:

BLM Technical Note 255. Habitat Management Series for Unique or Endangered Species. Report No. 13. Ferruginous Hawk.

Snyder, Noel F.R. and Helen A. Snyder. Raptors in Range Habitat. Symposium on Management of Forest and Range Habitats for Nongame Birds. Tucson, Arizona. 1975.

Unsuitability Determinations

Under this criterion, no federal lands or federal coal were determined to be unsuitable. A total of 15,287 acres of federal lands and 86,662,003 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable pending study. There are 3,455 acres of federal lands and 19,586,395 tons of federal coal determined to be acceptable with inventory needs. The remaining 21,958 acres of federal lands and 124,479,902 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable with no likely problems.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Comments questioned the draft unsuitability determinations because BLM and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service had not jointly determined "High priority habitat for migratory bird species of high federal interest on a regional or national basis." As a result of these comments, the unsuitable determinations have been changed to acceptable pending study.*

*Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has been initiated, but is not completed at this time.

15. State Resident Fish and Wildlife (Map 2-7)

CRITERION

Federal lands which the land management agency and the State jointly agree are fish and wildlife habitat for resident species of high interest to the State and which are essential for maintaining these priority wildlife species shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Such lands shall include:

--Active dancing and strutting grounds for sage grouse, sharp-tailed grouse, and prairie chicken.
--The most critical winter ranges for deer, antelope and elk.
--Migration corridors for elk.

Such lands may include appropriate buffer zones as determined jointly by the land management agency and the State.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	10,736	60,862,384
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	6,052	34,308,788
--with inventory needs	23,912	135,557,128
--with no likely problems	-0-	-0-

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The list of wildlife species of high state interest was obtained from the Wyoming Game and Fish Department. The habitats which are essential for maintaining these animals were determined to be those most critical habitats that are necessary for the survival or completion of the life cycle for a significant portion of the high interest populations. Such habitats presently include pronghorn most critical winter ranges and known sage grouse breeding complexes.

The criterion was applied with existing data on mule deer and sage grouse and on existing and new data collected jointly by the BLM and the Wyoming Game and Fish Department on pronghorn distributions and populations during the winter of 1978-79.

The sizes, locations, and importance of the essential, or most critical habitats, were jointly determined by the BLM and Wyoming Game and Fish Department biologists. The areas determined to be most critical pronghorn winter ranges were the result of consistent observations of a major segment of the herd unit during bitterly severe winter conditions. The observed distributions were

plotted on maps in order to delineate the most critical winter ranges. These observations and observations of other areas were correlated with past severe winter animal distributions in order to judge the severity of these conditions and the importance of this area for pronghorn survival.

Findings

All the areas determined to be most critical pronghorn and mule deer winter ranges were determined to be unsuitable. Two most critical pronghorn winter ranges were located within the boundaries of the review area. These winter ranges are believed to be the most critical due to the large portion of the herd unit using the areas during the severe 1978-79 winter (18% and 6%, for the Red Rim and China Butte sites, respectively, of the whole herd). These data, in conjunction with the previous year's observations of pronghorn using the area, indicated that the most critical determination was biologically correct. These two pronghorn and one mule deer winter ranges include 10,927 acres of federal lands (60,862,384 tons of federal coal). The one pronghorn most critical winter range along Red Rim contains 34,308,788 tons of federal coal while the combined pronghorn and mule deer most critical winter ranges near China Butte contain 135,557,128 tons of federal coal.

Two sage grouse strutting grounds are believed to occur on the site. However, the exact location and activity are presently uncertain. Therefore, the area between the suspected strutting ground and the 2-mile radius is determined to be acceptable pending study in order to delineate the strutting ground and the high use nesting areas (the 2-mile radius is the result of research on sage grouse nesting behavior conducted in Montana).

The one known sage grouse most critical winter area is determined to be acceptable pending study due to a lack of documentation.

All the remaining areas are determined to be acceptable with inventory needs in order to locate any other sage grouse breeding complexes and essential habitats for other species of high state interest.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

The data used to delineate the mule deer most critical winter range is based on several years of data gathered by the Wyoming Game and Fish Department. Aerial surveys conducted during the winter of 1978-79 substantiated this determination. The data were considered adequate.

The data used to delineate the pronghorn most critical winter ranges are based on data collected by the Wyoming Game and Fish Department during the past several years and new observations obtained from aerial surveys conducted by the BLM and Wyoming Game and Fish Department biologists during the winter of 1978-79. Although the delineation of the pronghorn most critical winter

range on Red Rim is based on 2 years of data, it is believed to be adequate when considering the severe winter conditions (1978-79), the high population losses experienced on nearby critical winter ranges, and the similarity between the pronghorn distributions this year compared to the last severe winter in 1972-73.

The sage grouse data are based on past observations of breeding behavior and presently occurring breeding activity. The locations and present activity are uncertain, although past observations have been made.

The sage grouse most critical winter area is delineated on the BLM URA Step 3 map and the Wyoming Game and Fish Department distribution maps. However, the accuracy of these data is unknown. Therefore, study of the area is needed before a determination can be made.

The literature used on sage grouse nesting behavior is as follows:

Wallested, R. and D. Pyrah. Movement and Nesting of Sage Grouse Hens in Central Montana. J.Wildl.Mgmt. 1974.

Western States Sage Grouse Committee. Guidelines for Habitat Protection in Sage Grouse Range. 1974.

Unsuitability Determinations

The areas identified as the most critical big game (mule deer and pronghorn) winter ranges are determined to be unsuitable. This would include 2,787 acres and 15,799,503 tons of federal coal near Red Rim and 7,949 acres and 45,062,881 tons near China Butte.

The two areas suspected to be active sage grouse strutting areas are determined to be acceptable pending study. A total of 5,000 federal acres (28,345,000 tons of federal coal) would be studied to locate the suspected strutting grounds and high use sage grouse nesting areas. Another 1,052 acres (5,963,567 tons of coal) are determined to be acceptable pending study for documentation of a most critical sage grouse winter area.

The remaining 23,912 acres and 135,557,128 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable with inventory needs in order to locate any more essential habitats.

EXCEPTIONS

A lease may be issued if:

1. It is demonstrated that complete mitigation is possible; or

2. Following discussions between the State wildlife agency and the Federal land management agency, the Federal land management agency determines that the species being protected will not be adversely affected by the mining activity.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	16,788	85,171,172
--with inventory needs	23,912	135,557,128
--with no likely problems	-0-	-0-

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

Application of the exception was considered using a review of available literature, inspections and review of existing mine reclamation in the region and knowledge of the ecological relationships of the area.

The literature review centered around reports and research on native browse plant establishment and diversity on disturbed sites in this region and precipitation zone.

Reclamation sites which had been inspected include the Medicine Bow Mine, the Seminoe I Mine, the Minerals Exploration uranium mine test site, and the EMRIA test site.

Findings

A review of available literature has shown that although there has been limited success in planting native shrub species in the intermountain region, there is much work to be done before improved reclamation as a mitigation can be demonstrated. With such problems as low levels of precipitation, high winds, uncertain seed sources, untested ecotypes, uncertain planting and seeding techniques, and unknown time frames (25 years), it can hardly be said that any adequate reclamation of most critical big game winter ranges has been demonstrated in this region. The necessity of a diverse species composition which includes several species of grasses, forbs, and shrubs, dictates that reclamation must be able to reestablish a variety of plants if the winter ranges are to maintain the present animal populations. Such reclamation has not been demonstrated to our knowledge.

Off-site mitigation was considered but deemed unfeasible for the Red Rim site, based on current information, because of the topographic characteristics of the site. The Red Rim area offers a unique topographic feature which is unavailable off-site. The areas to the east are too flat to provide relief from the wind and forage above the winter snows. The areas to the west are also not of a favorable topographic nature and are expected to become active mining operations within five years. The narrow band of habitat to the north is of similar terrain but strongly increases the possibility of collisions with trains and cars and is too small to support

this population. Finally, the winter ranges to the south, which support the bulk of the wintering herd, are unavailable to these additional animals due to the present migration patterns and animal distributions.

Notwithstanding the above discussion, the unsuitable determinations for the most critical antelope and deer habitat areas are changed to "acceptable pending study". This is determined appropriate through application of the "complete mitigation" and "protection of the spcies" exceptions under the following rationale:

1. Because mining activity will only disturb 200 acres per year, private industry should be allowed time to demonstrate or develop reclamation proposals dealing specifically with (a) restoration of broken topography as needed to provide shelter and windswept forage areas, (b) methods of establishing a grass, forb, and shrub vegetation community within acceptable time frames (5 years), and (c) interim mitigation measures for severe winters occurring during mining operations.

2. Indications from revised instructions pertaining to this criterion are that flexibility is intended regarding "complete mitigation" and "protection of the species."

3. Unsuitable determinations of public lands located in checkerboard land patterns, as in this case, directly affect land use planning on intermingled private lands. Under such conditions, it is Bureau policy to give associated parties a logical input in terms of time to collect data, supply recommendations, and to review our proposals. In this case, Rocky Mountain Energy, the owner of intermingled mineral rights, does need time to analyze reclamation possibilities and review the wildlife habitat situations against their mining plans.

4. Further study would more specifically estimate the degree of animal population loss as a result of strip mining.

5. An "acceptable pending study" determination would provide for longer term study and analysis of wildlife displacement areas.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

The data used to support the application of the exceptions are as follows:

Aerial surveys conducted by the BLM and the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (these data are believed to be adequate and up-to-date). Mortality and collision observations and reports from the Wyoming Game and Fish Department.

Monsen, Stephen B. Improved Range Plants. "Selecting Plants to Rehabilitate Disturbed Areas." Society for Range Management. Denver, Colorado. 1975.

Frischknect, Neil C. Use of Shrubs for Mined Land Reclamation and Wildlife Habitat. Intermountain Forest and Range Experimental Station, Forest Service, USDA. Ogden, Utah.

Unsuitability Determinations

There are 16,788 acres and 85,171,172 tons of federal coal determined to be acceptable pending study. The remaining 23,912 acres and 135,557,128 tons of federal coal are determined to be acceptable with inventory needs.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment from all sectors of the public focused on this criterion more than any of the other criteria. Comments addressed and questioned every aspect of applying the criterion and exceptions, including definitions, interpretations, data sources, quality of data, and the unsuitability determinations.

BLM has conducted intensive coordination with the Wyoming Department of Game and Fish regarding inventory data, habitat delineations, populations, and the unsuitability determinations. The Wyoming Game and Fish Departments' comments confirmed the existence of critical habitat for pronghorn and mule deer. They indicated that if the area is mined, the State of Wyoming could lose approximately 24% of the Baggs antelope herd, 1% of the Baggs mule deer herd, and sage grouse populations associated with two strutting grounds. They also indicated current data are insufficient to delineate critical sage grouse winter ranges. (See Appendix 1 for further detail on Wyoming Game and Fish Department comments).*

*The Wyoming Game and Fish Departments' comments were made based on the initial determination that identified the most critical habitats as unsuitable. The determinations have since been rivised to acceptable pending study based on the rationale in the above Findings section.

16. Wetlands (Map 2-8)

CRITERION

Federal lands containing: (1) inland lakes, impoundments, and associated wetlands; (2) inland shallow, predominantly vegetated wetlands; or (3) riverine wetland systems, lower perennial and upper perennial systems with flow greater than 5 cubic feet per second and riparian zones in a "relatively undisturbed" state that are larger than one linear mile along a riverine system, shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	44	249,436
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	90	510,210
--with inventory needs	40,566	229,968,654
--with no likely problems	-0-	-0-

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

Wetlands were evaluated using existing information consisting of a surface water inventory of public lands in Wyoming identifying perennial streams, reservoirs, lakes and ponds, and a 1977 Rawlins BLM District surface water inventory.

An inventory of wetland types has not been completed. Potential wetland sites and riparian zones are currently being identified based on 1:30,680 infrared aerial photographs. These potential areas must be ground checked during the spring prior to making a status determination.

Findings

The following streams and impoundments are determined to be unsuitable:

1. Muddy Creek from Section 2, T. 17 N., R. 91 W., to Section 12, T. 17 N., R. 92 W.

2. Impoundments located in SE¼, Section 22, T. 21 N., R. 89 W.; NW¼, Section 24, T. 21 N., R. 89 W.; SE¼, Section 14, T. 20 N., R. 90 W.; NW¼, Section 6, T. 19 N., R. 90 W.; NE¼, Section 18, T. 19 N., R. 90 W.; NW¼, Section 28, T. 19 N., R. 91 W.; SW¼, Section 32, T. 19 N., R. 91 W.; SE¼, Section 2, T. 18 N., R. 91 W.; SE¼, Section 12, T. 18 N., R. 91 W.; SE¼, Section 18, T. 18 N., R. 91 W.; SW¼, Section 24, T 18 N., R. 91 W.

Fillmore Creek from N½, Section 8, T. 18 N., R. 90 W., to the boundary between Sections 20 and 21, T. 19 N., R. 91 W., and Separation Creek from the boundary of Sections 10 and 11, T. 19 N.,

R. 90 W., to the point where it crosses Interstate 80 in Section 21, T. 21 N., R. 89 W., is determined to be acceptable pending further study because flow data are lacking.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Carnevale, Mike and Ron Gumtow. Description of a Baseline Inventory of Surface Waters on Public Lands in Wyoming. USDI, BLM, Division of Resources, Cheyenne, Wyoming.

Rawlins District BLM. Surface Water Inventory. 1975.
URA Level II Reconnaissance Data, Muddy Creek. 1978.

USGS. Water Quality, Miscellaneous Sites. 1976.

Unsuitability Determinations

Muddy Creek and impoundments are determined to be unsuitable. Fillmore Creek and Separation Creek are determined to be acceptable pending study. The remaining public lands are determined to be acceptable with inventory needs.

EXCEPTIONS

A lease may be issued where the land management agency determines that:

1. The use of appropriate mining or reclamation technology will not significantly affect the wetlands or will provide for complete restoration, or

2. The wetlands contain no significant values for groundwater recharge, fish and wildlife habitat, recreation, or scientific study.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	34	192,746
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	90	510,210
--with inventory needs	40,576	230,025,344
--with no likely problems	-0-	-0-

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The exceptions were applied to only those wetlands determined to be unsuitable by criteria and acceptable under multiple use analysis. Therefore, only impoundments and a portion of Separation Creek on public lands were addressed.

Findings

After applying the exceptions all impoundments described above are determined to be acceptable with inventory needs. Field verification of impoundment acreages is needed since those impoundments of less than 5 acres can be determined and would become acceptable with no likely problems.

Also Section 20, T. 19 N., R. 90 W., of Separation Creek is determined to be acceptable pending study.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Rawlins District BLM. Surface Water Inventory. 1975.

Unsuitability Determinations

After applying the exceptions, 34 acres of federal lands along Muddy Creek are determined to be unsuitable. The remaining acres are determined to be acceptable with inventory needs (40,576 acres) or acceptable pending study (90 acres).

PUBLIC COMMENT

Comments received indicated that BLM has not demonstrated that mining would significantly affect the wetlands or that reclamation would not provide for complete restoration.*

*The exception to the criterion requiring complete restoration was applied to all impoundments changing them from unsuitable to acceptable pending study. Complete restoration was not deemed possible for Muddy Creek.

17. Floodplains (Map 2-9)

CRITERION

Riverine, coastal, and special floodplains (100-year recurrence interval) shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	4,746	26,905,074
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	35,954	203,823,226

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The method used to determine floodplains was to review soil surveys showing soils developed on floodplains and to apply the guidelines in Instruction Memo WY-79-90 to these areas. The floodplains identified correspond to the areas which are also possible Alluvial Valley Floors (Criterion 23).

Findings

The following drainages meet the conditions set up to determine floodplain areas (see overlay):

1. Muddy Creek from Section 2, T. 17 N., R. 91 W., to Section 12, T. 17 N., R. 92 W.

2. Fillmore Creek from NW¼, Section 8, T. 18 N., R. 90 W., to the boundary between Sections 20 and 21, T. 19 N., R. 91 W.

3. Separation Creek from the boundary of Sections 10 and 11, T. 19 N., R. 90 W., to the point where it crosses Interstate 80 in Section 21, T. 21 N., R. 89 W.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

USGS 7½ minute topographic maps
SCS Order III soil surveys and aerial photos

Unsuitability Determinations

Those previously described areas under "Findings" (i.e., Muddy Creek, Fillmore Creek, Separation Creek) are determined to be unsuitable. All other federal lands are determined to be acceptable with no likely problems

EXCEPTIONS

Leasing may be allowed where the land management agency determines that:

1. Leasing a particular tract is the only practicable alternative, and

2. Potential for harm to people or property and natural and beneficial values of floodplains can be minimized through use of demonstrated and available mining and mitigation measures.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	3,530	20,011,570
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	1,216	6,893,504
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	35,954	203,823,226

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The exceptions were evaluated using proposed mining regulations and preliminary mining plans.

Findings

The following floodplain areas remain unsuitable after applying the exceptions:

1. Muddy Creek from Section 2, T. 17 N., R. 91 W., to Section 12, T. 17 N., R. 92 W.

2. Fillmore Creek--NW¼, Section 8, T. 18 N., R. 90 W.; SE¼, Section 6, T. 18 N., R. 90 W.; NE¼, Section 2, T. 18 N., R. 91 W.; SE¼, NW¼, Section 22, T. 19 N., R. 91 W.

3. Separation Creek--E½SE¼, NE¼SW¼, Section 10, T. 19 N., R. 90 W.; S½SE¼, NW¼, Section 8, T. 19 N., R. 90 W.; NE¼SE¼, SE¼SE¼, Section 6, T. 19 N., R. 90 W.; E½SW¼, NW¼SE¼, NE¼, Section 32, T. 20 N., R. 90 W.; W½SW¼, NE¼SW¼, NW¼, Section 28, T. 20 N., R. 90 W.; NW¼, Section 22, T. 20 N., R. 90 W.; SE¼, E½NE¼, Section 10, T. 20 N., R. 90 W., SW¼, W½NE¼, Section 2, T. 20 N., R. 90 W.; E½SW¼, NW¼, W½NE¼, NE¼NE¼, Section 28, T. 21 N., R. 89 W. (See multiple use overlay for exact boundaries.)

After applying the exceptions, the following floodplains are determined to be acceptable pending study:

1. Fillmore Creek--NW¼, Section 6, T. 18 N., R. 90 W., which is private ownership, federal minerals; and NE¼, Section 22, T. 19 N., R. 91 W.

2. Separation Creek--W½E½, Section 20, T. 19 N., R. 90 W., SE¼SE¼, NW¼SW¼, Section 10, T. 19 N., R. 90 W.; E½NW¼, Section 6, T. 19 N., R. 90 W.; NE¼NE¼, SE¼NE¼, NE¼SE¼, SE¼SE¼, Section 2, T. 20 N., R. 90 W.; NW¼NW¼, Section 12, T. 20 N., R. 90 W.; NE¼SE¼, Section 32, T. 21 N., R. 89 W.

Potential for harm and other values can be minimized by proposed regulations.

Data Source and Quality of Data

U.S. Department of Interior, EMRIA Report 7, Red Rim Study Area. 1976.

U.S. Department of Interior, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement. Surface Coal Mining and Reclamation Operations.

Unsuitability Determinations

Those floodplain areas described under "Findings" remain unsuitable. All of Muddy Creek and most of Fillmore and Separation Creeks (3,530 acres) are determined to be unsuitable. Areas determined to be acceptable pending study include 1,216 acres along Fillmore and Separation Creeks. The remaining acres within the review area are determined to be acceptable with no likely problems.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Comments received indicated that application of the exceptions should make potentially unsuitable areas acceptable for further consideration for coal development.*

*Application of the exceptions did change unsuitable determinations to acceptable pending study in all cases, except where the area was already determined to be unacceptable because of multiple use conflicts.

18. Municipal Watersheds

CRITERION

Federal lands which have been committed by the land management agency to use as municipal watersheds shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,700	230,728,300

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The Overland URA and MFP were examined to determine if any area has been designated as a municipal watershed.

Findings

No designated municipal watersheds were found in the review area.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

The Overland URA and MFP are both good sources of data.

Unsuitability Determinations

All of the review area is determined to be acceptable with no likely problems.

EXCEPTIONS

Leasing may be allowed where:

1. The land management agency determines that mining will not adversely affect the watershed to any significant degree, and

2. The municipality or water users concur in the issuance of the lease.

18. Municipal Watersheds

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,700	230,728,300

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

Not applicable.

Findings

Not applicable

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

All of the review area is determined to be acceptable with no likely problems under this criterion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments were received relative to application of this criterion.

19. National Resource Waters

CRITERION

Federal lands with National Resource Waters, as identified by states in their water quality management plans, and a buffer zone of federal lands ¼ mile from the outer edge of the far banks of the water, shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,700	230,728,300

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

In Wyoming, national resource waters are those waters designated as Class I waters in the Wyoming Water Quality Rules and Regulations. This listing was examined for such waters that might be within the review area.

Findings

None of the Wyoming Class I waters or proposed Class I waters are within the review area.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Data were obtained from the Wyoming Water Quality Rules and Regulations, Chapter 1, Quality Standards for Wyoming Surface Waters. An additional listing of proposed additions to the Class I water's list presented to the Wyoming Environmental Quality Council on March 28, 1979, was also examined. These data are current and are of excellent quality.

Unsuitability Determinations

All of the review area is determined to be acceptable with no likely problems.

EXCEPTION

The buffer zone may be eliminated or reduced in size where the land management agency determines that it is not necessary to protect the National Resource Waters.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	-0-	-0-
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,700	230,728,300

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The exception was not applied.

Findings

Not applicable.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

All of the Review Area is determined to be acceptable with no likely problems under this criterion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment was received relative to application of this criterion.

20. State Lands Unsuitable

CRITERION

A buffer zone of Federal lands necessary to provide protection for any adjacent area designated as land unsuitable for mining by the State shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable		
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study		
--with inventory needs		
--with no likely problems		

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The State of Wyoming was contacted by the BLM.

Findings

The State of Wyoming has not yet identified any lands as unsuitable for mining. Neither has the state identified the need for any buffer zones on federal lands for the protection of state lands.

Data Source and Quality of Data

State of Wyoming.

Unsuitability Determinations

All lands in the review area are determined to be acceptable with no likely problems under this criterion.

EXCEPTION

The buffer zone may be modified or eliminated where the land management agency, in consultation with the State, determines that all or parts of the zone are not necessary to protect the designated area.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable		
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study		
--with inventory needs		
--with no likely problems		

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

20. State Lands Unsuitable

CRITERION

A buffer zone of federal lands necessary to provide protection for any adjacent area designated as land unsuitable for mining by the State shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable		
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study		
--with inventory needs		
--with no likely problems		

*Assuming an average of 5000 tons/acre.

Process

The State of Wyoming was contacted by BLM.

Findings

The State of Wyoming has not yet identified any lands as unsuitable for mining. Neither has the state identified the need for any buffer zones on federal lands for the protection of state lands

Data Source and Quality of Data

State of Wyoming

Unsuitability Determinations

All lands in the review area are determined to be acceptable with no likely problems under this criterion.

EXCEPTION

The buffer zone may be modified or eliminated where the land management agency, in consultation with the State, determines that all or parts of the zone are not necessary to protect the designated area.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable		
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study		
--with inventory needs		
--with no likely problems		

*Assuming an average of 5000 tons/acre.

Process

Not applicable.

Findings

Not applicable.

Data Source and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

All lands in the review area are determined to be acceptable with no likely problems under this criterion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

One comment questioned how BLM could apply this criterion when the state has not had time to designate "state lands unsuitable."*

*BLM contacted the State during the process and they indicated there were no state lands designated unsuitable. Thus, this criterion was not applied. The acceptable determination is considered appropriate under the provision of the exception.

21. State Proposed Criteria

CRITERION

Federal lands in a State to which is applicable a criterion (i) proposed by the State, and (ii) adopted by rulemaking by the Secretary of the Interior, shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable		
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study		
--with inventory needs		
--with no likely problems		

*Assuming an average of 5,669 tons/acre.

Process

The State of Wyoming presently has no criteria, therefore, the criterion has not been applied.

Findings

Not applicable.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

Not applicable.

EXCEPTIONS

A lease may be issued for any area:

1. Irrespective of the applicability of the State-nominated criterion, if such criterion is adopted by the Secretary less than 12 months prior to the publication of the draft land use plan which applies to such area; or

2. Where the land management agency in consultation with the State determines that, although the criterion applies, mining will not adversely affect the value which the criterion would protect.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal	
	Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable		
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study		
--with inventory needs		
--with no likely problems		

*Assuming an average of 5,669 tons/acre.

Process

Not applicable.

Findings

Not applicable.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

The State of Wyoming presently has no criteria, therefore, the criterion has not been applied.

PUBLIC COMMENT

One comment questioned how BLM could apply this criterion when the state has not had adequate time to develop state proposed criteria.*

*BLM did not apply this criterion, since the state does not have "state proposed criteria."

22. Prime Farmlands (Map 2-9)

CRITERION

When the land management agency, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture (Soil Conservation Service), identifies Federal lands having prime farmland soils, such lands shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	360	2,040,840
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,340	228,687,460

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The Soil Conservation Service (SCS) soil survey was examined for prime farmland mapping units which fell within the review area. The narratives were used as well as aerial photographs showing mapping units.

Findings

An area of prime farmland soil exists in T. 21 N., R. 89 W., Sections 30 and 32. The soil is a Tresano Loam (mapping unit #34A) on federal land, not irrigated but contiguous to private land under irrigation. This soil may have some profiles with pH greater than 8.4 which might drop it out of the prime classification.

The following areas are on the prime list but are not irrigated or contiguous to irrigated lands:

1. T. 20 N., R. 89 W., Sections 16 and 20 (soil map unit #237).
2. T. 19 N., R. 90 W., Sections 10, 16, and 22 (soil map unit #237).
3. T. 19 N., R. 90 W., Sections 28 and 32 (soil map unit #237).

These soils do not meet all the conditions to be prime.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

The data source was the SCS soil survey and accompanying aerial photographs, and the SCS prime farmland soil mapping units. These are excellent data sources.

Unsuitability Determinations

The soil in T. 21 N., R. 89 W., Sections 30 and 32, is very possibly a prime farmland since it is contiguous to irrigated soils. But further study is necessary to be sure the pH is not greater than 8.4. Therefore the 360 acres covered by the soil are determined to be acceptable pending study. The remainder of the Review Area is determined to be acceptable with no likely problems.

EXCEPTIONS

A lease may be issued when:

1. Conditions such as soil rockiness, angle of slope, or historic or other conditions leading to a negative determination under the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) soil survey was permanent regulations of the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM) are present; or

2. Scientific studies show that crop yields equivalent to pre-mining crop yields on non-mined prime farmlands in the surrounding area under equivalent levels of management could be obtained and that an operator or potential operator could meet the soil reconstruction standards in section 515(b)(7) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA) and OSM's permanent regulations.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	-0-	-0-
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	360	2,040,840
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	40,340	228,687,460

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

The exceptions were not applied.

Findings

Not applicable.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

Under this criterion, the area in T. 21 N., R. 89 W., Sections 30 and 32 is determined to be acceptable pending study. The remainder of the review area is determined to be acceptable with no likely problems.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The only comment received relative to this criterion was a question which asked "who determines if an area meets the criteria for prime farmland."*

*BLM determined the prime farmland areas using the SCS soil survey of the area. No area was determined to be unsuitable.

23. Alluvial Valley Floors (Map 2-2)

Federal lands identified by the land management agency, with the concurrence of the State in which they are located, as alluvial valley floors according to the definition and standards of the SMCRA, regulations, final alluvial valley floor guidelines, and approved State programs, where mining would interrupt, discontinue, or preclude farming, shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining. Additionally, when mining Federal land outside an alluvial valley floor would materially damage the quantity or quality of water in surface or underground water systems which would supply alluvial valley floors, that land shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	200	1,133,800
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	12,559	71,196,971
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	27,941	158,397,529

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

If the draft technical guidelines developed by the Office of Surface Mining (OSM) were to be used, we would be unable to reach any conclusions within the time frame of this study. The guidelines used in this determination are described fully in instruction memoranda WY-79-90, and WY-79-90 Change 1. To determine if the valley in question is a possible or probable AVF, one of the following standards would have to be met:

Step 1.

1. Drainage Basin is greater than 2 square miles.

2. Cultivated, hayed, or farmed.

3. Valley width is greater than 300 feet and stream channel shows red on infrared (IR) and stream channel shows on USGS 7½ minute quadrangle.

To distinguish between the "possible" and "probable" AVFs, the following standards were used:

Step 2.

1. Geomorphic valley width is greater than ¼ mile.

2. Hayed, seeded, or cultivated.

3. Flood irrigated.

4. Significant portions of geomorphic valley show up red on color IR and perennial stream (USGS 7½ minute quadrangle).

Standard number 1 is a necessary condition, and the valley must also meet at least 2 of standards 2 through 4 to be classfied a probable AVF.

The geomorphic valleys of drainages in the Red Rim-China Butte area were defined using USGS 7½ minute topographic maps, black and white aerial photographs--scales varying from 2 to 4 inches per mile, and a soil survey conducted by the Soil Conservation Service. The standards described in the previously mentioned instruction memoranda were then applied to these valleys using the same maps and photos as were used in defining these valleys. Black and white aerial photographs and infrared aerial photographs were also used in applying these standards.

Findings

The portion of Separation Creek Valley within Sections 31 and 32, T. 21 N., R. 89 W., is described as follows:

Step 2--Drainage basin is greater than 2 square miles; is cultivated, hayed, or farmed; valley width is greater than 300 feet, and stream channel shows red on color IR and stream channel shows on USGS 7½ minute quadrangle. This segment, therefore, falls into the possible/probable group of AVFs.

Application of the Step 3 standards was completed next:

Step 3--Geomorphic valley width is greater than ¼ mile; is hayed, seeded, or cultivated; is flood irrigated. This segment is, therefore, in the group of probable AVFs.

Separation Creek from T. 19 N., R. 90 W., Section 10, SE¼, downstream to the point where Fillmore Creek joins it is described as follows:

Step 2--Drainage basin is greater than 2 square miles; valley width is greater than 300 feet, stream channel shows red on color IR and stream channel shows on USGS 7½ minute quadrangle. Separation Creek, therefore, falls into the possible/probable group of AVFs.

Application of the step 3 standards revealed the following:

Step 3--Valley width averages ¼ mile wide downstream from the boundary between Sections 8 and 9, T. 19 N., R. 90 W. Separation Creek does not meet sufficient Step 3 standards and, therefore, remains a possible AVF.

Fillmore Creek from T. 18 N., R. 90 W., Section 8, NE¼NE¼, to the west boundary of Section 21, T. 19 N., R. 91 W., is described as follows:

Step 2--Drainage basin is greater than 2 square miles; valley width is larger than 300 feet, and stream channel is predominantly red on color IR, and stream channel shows on USGS 7½ minute quadrangle. This portion of Fillmore Creek, therefore, falls into the possible/probable category of AVFs.

Step 3--Geomorphic valley averages about ¼ mile in width; no other characteristics determined. This portion of Fillmore Creek, therefore, remains in the possible group of AVFs.

Fillmore Creek from the south boundary of T. 21 N., R. 90 W., Section 34, to the point where it enters Separation Creek was described because the geomorphic valley is partially within the area of consideration. It is described as follows:

Step 2--Drainage basin is greater than 2 square miles; valley width is greater than 300 feet, and stream channel shows red on color IR, and stream channel shows on USGS 7½ minute quadrangle. This segment, therefore, falls into the possible/probable category of AVFs.

Step 3--Geomorphic valley width is greater than ¼ mile; other characteristics not determined. This segment, therefore, remains in the possible category of AVFs.

Muddy Creek from the east boundary of T. 17 N., R. 91 W., Section 2, to T. 17 N., R. 92 W., Section 12, NW¼NE¼, is described as follows:

Step 2--Drainage basin is greater than 2 square miles; valley width is greater than 300 feet, and stream channel shows red on color IR, and stream channel shows on USGS 7½ minute quadrangle. This stream valley, therefore, falls into the possible/probable category of AVFs.

Step 3--Width averages are greater than ¼ mile; is a perennial stream and significant portions of the geomorphic valley show up red on IR. This stream valley, therefore, remains in the possible AVF category.

Olson Draw from the boundary between Sections 25 and 26, T. 18 N., R. 91 W., to the point where it enters Muddy Creek is described as follows:

Step 2--Drainage basin is greater than 2 square miles. Olson Draw, therefore, falls into the category of possible/probable AVFs.

Step 3--Geomorphic valley width averages about ¼ mile; no other criteria determined. Olson Draw remains in the possible AVF category.

Holler Draw from T. 18 N., R. 92 W., Section 24, NE¼SE¼, to the point where it enters Muddy Creek is described as follows:

Step 2--Drainage basin is greater than 2 square miles. Holler Draw is, therefore, in the category of possible/probable AVFs.

Step 3--Geomorphic valley averages are greater than ¼ mile in width. Holler Draw, therefore, remains a possible AVF.

Bad Water Creek from T. 18 N., R. 91 W., Section 8, NE¼, to the point where it enters Fillmore Creek is described as follows:

Step 2--Drainage basin is greater than 2 square miles. Bad Water Creek is, therefore, in the possible/probable AVF category.

Step 3--Geomorphic valley width is greater than ¼ mile. Bad Water Creek is, therefore, a possible AVF.

The unnamed drainage entering Separation Creek in the NE¼NE¼, Section 21, T. 21 N., R. 89 W., from T. 20 N., R. 89 W., Section 16, NW¼NW¼, to the point where it enters Separation Creek is described as follows:

Step 2--Drainage basin is greater than 2 square miles. This drainage is, therefore, put into the possible/probable AVF group.

Step 3--Geomorphic valley width is greater than ¼ mile. No other characteristics determined. This drainage remains in the possible AVF group.

Other drainages and segments of drainages met criterion number 1 of Step 2 (drainage basin is greater than 2 square miles). These streams include Chicken Springs and the tributary of Fillmore Creek entering in the SW¼NW¼, Section 7, T. 20 N., R. 90 W. These drainages have relatively narrow geomorphic valleys, no apparent water supply for irrigation, and somewhat limited drainage areas. These drainages are, therefore, being put into the unlikely AVF category along with all other drainages not previously mentioned.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

USGS 7½ minute quadrangle maps
Black and white aerial photographs
Color infrared aerial photographs
Soil Conservation Service soil maps

Unsuitability Determinations

That portion of Separation Creek Valley located in T. 21 N., R. 89 W., Section 32, N½NW¼, SW¼NW¼, E½SE¼, is determined to be unsuitable. A 1-mile buffer zone around this portion of the valley is determined to be acceptable pending study.

The following are determined to be acceptable pending study:

1. Separation Creek Valley from T. 19 N., R. 90 W., Section 10, SE¼, downstream to the point where Fillmore Creek joins it.

2. Fillmore Creek Valley from T. 18 N., R. 90 W., Section 8, NE¼NE¼, to the western boundary of T. 19 N., R. 91 W., Section 21.

3. Fillmore Creek Valley from the south boundary of T. 21 N., R. 90 W., Section 34, to the point were it enters Separation Creek.

4. Muddy Creek from the east boundary of T. 17 N., R. 91 W., Section 2, to T. 17 N., R. 92 W., Section 12, NW¼NE¼.

5. Olson Draw Valley from the boundary between Sections 25 and 26, T. 18 N., R. 91 W., to the point where it enters Muddy Creek.

6. Holler Draw Valley from T. 18 N., R. 92 W., Section 24, NE¼SE¼, to the point where it enters Muddy Creek.

7. Bad Water Creek Valley from T. 18 N., R. 91 W., Section 8, NE¼, to the point where it enters Fillmore Creek.

8. The valley of the unnamed drainage entering Separation Creek in T. 21 N., R. 89 W., Section 21, NE¼NE¼, from T. 20 N., R. 89 W., Section 16, NW¼NW¼, to the point where it enters Separation Creek.

A buffer zone ¼-mile around the preceeding valleys (1 through 8) is determined to be acceptable pending study per IM WY-79-90, Change 1.

The remainder of the Red Rim-China Butte area is determined to be acceptable with no likely problems.

EXCEPTION

A lease may be issued where mining would not interrupt, discontinue, or preclude farming on land to which the first sentence of the criterion applies.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable	200	1,133,800
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study	12,559	71,196,971
--with inventory needs	-0-	-0-
--with no likely problems	27,941	158,397,529

*Assuming an average of 5669 tons/acre.

Process

Most of the land determined to be unsuitable by this criterion was also found unacceptable by multiple use analysis. Approximately 30 acres in T. 21 N., R. 88 W., Section 32, NE¼SE¼, was determined to be unsuitable by this criterion and acceptable by multiple use. To this latter tract, the exception was applied as written.

Findings

That portion of Separation Creek Valley to which the exception was applied remains unsuitable. Mining would interrupt and preclude farming on these lands.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

USGS 7½ minute quadrangle maps
Black and white aerial photographs
Color infrared aerial photographs
Soil Conservation Service soil maps

Unsuitability Determinations

Unsuitability determinations are unchanged from determinations made prior to application of the exception.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Comments related to this criterion questioned the methodology used to identify the alluvial valley floors and the determination that 200 acres are unsuitable. The comments also point out that state concurrence, as required by the criterion, is lacking.*

*BLM (Wyoming) developed the alternative methodology because the lack of time and data precluded use of Office of Surface Mining (OSM) and Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) guidelines.

BLM submitted the methodology and findings to OSM and DEQ for review. DEQ did not concur and OSM has not responded.

24. Reclaimability

CRITERION

As information regarding reclaimability on a local or regional basis becomes available, the land management agency shall use such information to determine if areas of Federal land are reclaimable to the standards of SMCRA, the regulations, and approved State programs. Examples of information on reclaimability would be soil studies, hydrologic studies, and studies concerning revegetation. If any area is determined not to be so reclaimable, such area shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal	
	Acres	Tons*
Unsuitable		
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study		
--with inventory needs		
--with no likely problems		

*Assuming an average of 5,669 tons/acre.

Process

This criterion requires information on hydrologic, soil, and revegetation studies that have not been done by either the federal government or the coal companies. There are several studies in hydrology and soil classification, but the studies are in the beginning stages, therefore no pertinent information can be assimilated from them.

It has not in fact been proven that reclamation of areas to as good as or better than before mining is possible. If reclamation techniques could be developed to a high degree, mitigation could be incorporated in future efforts.

Findings

Not applicable.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

Not applicable.

EXCEPTIONS

A lease may be issued upon presentation of information which contains results of studies showing that reclamation is possible to the standards of the SMCRA, OSM's permanent regulations and approved State programs, including State regulation.

Summary of Results

	Federal Coal Acres	Tons*
Unsiutable		
Acceptable for further consideration for coal development:		
--pending study		
--with inventory needs		
--with no likely problems		

*Assuming an average of 5,669 tons/acre.

Process

Not applicable.

Findings

Not applicable.

Data Sources and Quality of Data

Not applicable.

Unsuitability Determinations

Not applicable.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The comments on this criterion related to the reclaimability of the area. Some comments indicated reclamation is possible while others questioned whether reclamation success has been demonstrated.*

*BLM did not apply this criterion due to a lack of data at this time.

RED RIM / CHINA BUTTE

R 90 W R 89 W R 88 W

R 91 W

1 0 1 2 3 4 MILES

T 21 N

T 20 N

T 19 N

T 17 N

Creston

EIGHTMILE BRIDGE

PACIFIC

LINCOLN

UNION

Drew

ROAD

SWEETWATER

CARBON

DIVIDE

BASIN

Red Rim

Ridge ROAD

Hogback

Continental

DALEY

TWENTYMILE

SIXTEENMILE RES.

Scotty

Horse Butte

Cow Butte

Holler Drew

Alameda

Snowshoe

Canyon

Gulch

MUDDY

BORRY

HWY

TRAIL

SLAB

China Butte

WAHAKIE STA. (HISTORICAL RUINS)

OVERLAND

TRAIL

ORIGINAL STAGE STA

Baldy Butte

DOTY

Mtn.

Doty

Top

Hollow

Map 2-1
UNSUITABILITY CRITERIA NUMBERS 2 AND 3 (Rights-of-Way and Easements; Buffer Zones along Rights-of-Way, and Adjacent to Communities and Buildings)

X Unsuitable (Rights-of-Way)

Unsuitable (Buffer Zones)

Acceptable With No Likley Problems



RED RIM / CHINA BUTTE



Map 2-2
UNSUITABILITY CRITERIA NUMBERS 6 AND 23 (Scientific Studies and Alluvial Valley Floors)

- Unsuitable
- Acceptable Pending Study
- Acceptable With No Likely Problems



RED RIM / CHINA BUTTE



Map 2-3
UNSUITABILITY CRITERION NUMBER 9
(Endangered Species)

- Acceptable With Inventory Needs
- Acceptable With No Likley Problems



RED RIM / CHINA BUTTE



Map 2-4
UNSUITABILITY CRITERIA NUMBERS 11 AND 12 (Golden Eagle Nesting Sites and Concentration Areas)

- Unsuitable
- Acceptable Pending Study
- Acceptable With Inventory Needs
- Acceptable With No Likely Problems



RED RIM / CHINA BUTTE





RED RIM / CHINA BUTTE



Map 2-6
UNSUITABILITY CRITERION NUMBER 14
(Migratory Birds)

- Acceptable Pending Study
- Acceptable With Inventory Needs
- Acceptable With No Lilely Problems



RED RIM / CHINA BUTTE



Map 2-7
UNSUITABILITY CRITERION NUMBER 15
(State Resident Fish and Wildlife)

- Unsuitable
- Acceptable Pending Study
- Acceptable With Inventory Needs
- Acceptable With No Likley Problems



RED RIM / CHINA BUTTE



Map 2-8
UNSUITABILITY CRITERION NUMBER 16
(Wetlands)

- Unsuitable (Muddy Creek Impoundments)
- Acceptable Pending Study (Separation Creek and Fillmore Creek)
- Acceptable With Inventory Needs
- Acceptable With No Likley Problems



RED RIM / CHINA BUTTE





RED RIM / CHINA BUTTE



Map 2-10
COAL DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL--
SURFACE MINING

- High
- Moderate
- Low
- Unknown

Dashed lines indicate BLM projections.
No data from USGS.

R 90 W R 89 W R 88 W

1 0 1 2 3 4 MILES

T 21 N

T 20 N

T 19 N

T 17 N

R 91 W

Creston

EIGHTMILE BRIDGE

LINCOLN

UNION

WEETWATER

DIVIDE

BASIN

Red Rim

Continental

Hogback

TWENTYMILE

SIXTEENMILE RES.

Horse Butte

Cow Butte

Holler Draw

Alameda

Snowshoe

Canyon

SORRY

NUDDY

TRAIL

ORIGINAL STAGE STA.

China Butte STA

OVERLAND

Baldy Butte

DOTY

Map 2-11
COAL DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL–
SUBSURFACE MINING

- High
- Moderate
- Low
- Unknown

Dashed lines indicate BLM projections.
No data from USGS.



CHAPTER 3

INTRODUCTION

Fifty-four percent of the coal reserves in the United States are located west of the Mississippi River. In the past few years production of western coal has increased rapidly, rising from 60 million tons in 1972 to 166 million tons in 1977 (24 percent of total 1977 coal production in the United States). This upward trend is expected to continue, as coal will make increasingly important contributions to the nation's energy supplies, especially for electric power generation, and as demand for coal increases in the western states.

Federally owned coal is concentrated in the six western coal producing states of Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming, which together, in 1977, together accounted for 71 percent of the production of all western coal. Within these six western coal producing states, there are regions in which the coal is concentrated. These regions are as follows:

1. Fort Union Region covering western North Dakota, northwest South Dakota, and eastern Montana.

2. Powder River Region covering southcentral Montana and northeast Wyoming.

3. Green River/Hams Fork Region covering southwestern and southcentral Wyoming, southeast Idaho, northeast Utah, northwest Colorado.

4. Uinta-Southwestern Utah Region covering eastcentral Utah, central Utah, southwest Utah, and central northwest Colorado.

5. San Juan River Region covering southwest Colorado, northwest New Mexico and northeast Arizona.

6. Denver-Raton Mesa Region covering southcentral Colorado, northcentral Colorado and northcentral New Mexico.

The above stated coal bearing Regions are depicted on Map 3-1. Production of federal coal in these states was 51.7 million tons in 1977, or 93.7 percent of their total coal production and 7.5 percent of national coal production. Of overall western coal reserves, approximately 60 percent is owned by the federal government and an additional 20 percent is dependent on the availability of complementing federal coal for its production. (DES, Coal Programmatic, Dec. 78)

Wyoming's coal bearing areas are divided into 10 major regions, basins, or fields which underlie more than 90,000 square miles or approximately 41 percent of the state and which collectively contain about 24 percent of the nation's coal resources under less than 6,000 feet of overburden (See Map 3-2). These are as follows:



MAP 3-1

TWELVE COAL SUPPLY REGIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

1. Powder River Coal Basin
2. Green River Coal Region
3. Hams Fork Coal Region
4. Hanna Coal Field
5. Wind River Coal Basin
6. Bighorn Coal Basin
7. Rock Creek Coal Field
8. Jackson Hole Coal Field
9. Black Hills Coal Region
10. Goshen Hole Coal Field

For the purpose of this report the Green River Region and the Hams Fork Region have been combined as the Green River/Hams Fork Region. Within the Green River/Hams Fork Region there are ten coal fields. Locations of these ten coal fields are as follows:

Within the Hams Fork Region, there are four coal fields:

1. Evanston
2. Kemmerer
3. Greys River
4. McDougal

While within the Green River Region, there are six fields:

1. Kindt Basin
2. Great Divide Basin
3. Little Snake River
4. Rock Springs
5. Henry's Fork
6. Labarge Ridge

(Glass, 1978)



MAP 3-2 Wyoming Coal-Bearing Areas



GREEN RIVER-HAMS FORK REGION

POTENTIAL COAL RESOURCE INVOLVED

Future production of federal coal reserves can come from either already issued federal lease or new leases. As shown in Table 3-1, there are currently 534 outstanding federal coal leases with estimated recoverable reserves of 17 billion tons (Federal Coal Management Program DES, 1978).

TABLE 3-1
OUTSTANDING FEDERAL COAL LEASES

COAL REGION	NUMBER OF LEASES	ACREAGE LEASED	RECOVERABLE SURFACE RESERVES (million tons)	RECOVERABLE UNDERGROUND RESERVES (million tons)	TOTAL RECOVERABLE RESERVES (million tons)
Green River-Hams Fork:					
Wyoming	38	82,452	374.6	547.7	922.3
Colorado	34	33,946	289.8	198.3	488.1
SubTotal	72	116,398	664.4	746.0	1,410.4
TOTAL	534	790,816	11,484.4	5,603.7	17,088.1

Source: Federal Coal Management Program DES, 1978.

Of the total (534) federal coal leases, 72 or 13.48 percent, are in the Green River-Hams Fork region and 38, or 7.11 percent are in Wyoming.

Of the total (790,816) federal acres under lease, 116,398, or 14.71 percent, are in the Green River-Hams Fork region and 82,452, or 10.42 percent, are in Wyoming.

The grand total of recoverable surface reserves in millions of tons contained in the 534 federal coal lease is 11,484.4. The Green River-Hams Fork region contains 664.4 million tons, or 5.78 percent, and Wyoming contains 274.6 million tons, or 3.26 percent.

DEMAND FOR COAL RESOURCES

While the precise rate of demand is unknown, there is little question that the nation's overall energy requirements will continue to grow. New technologies and energy forms are still unproven and cannot be relied upon over the next decade or so. In the next decade, the United States will be forced to address the problem of growing energy demands largely through a combination of three basic types of actions. These actions would be to--

GREEN RIVER-HAMS FORK REGION

POTENTIAL COAL RESOURCE INVOLVED

Future production of federal coal reserves can come from either already issued federal lease or new leases. As shown in Table 3-1, there are currently 334 outstanding federal coal leases with estimated recoverable reserves of 17 billion tons (Federal Coal Management Program DEIS, 1979).

TABLE 3-1

OUTSTANDING FEDERAL COAL LEASES

COAL REGION	NUMBER OF LEASES	ACREAGE LEASED (Million Acres)	RECOVERABLE RESERVES (Million Tons)	RECOVERABLE UNDERGROUND RESERVES (Million Tons)	TOTAL RECOVERABLE RESERVES (Million Tons)
Green River-Hams Fork:					
Wyoming	38	81,432	379.4	341.1	720.5
Colorado	34	33,940	285.0	198.3	483.3
SubTotal	72	116,384	664.4	746.0	1,410.4
TOTAL	334	760,816	11,484.4	5,603.7	17,088.1

Source: Federal Coal Management Program DEIS (1979).

Of the total (334) federal coal leases, 72 or 21.6% percent, are in the Green River-Hams Fork region and 38, or 11.4% percent are in Wyoming.

Of the total (760,816) federal acres under lease, 116,384, or 15.3% percent, are in the Green River-Hams Fork region and 81,432, or 10.7% percent, are in Wyoming.

The grand total of recoverable surface reserves in millions of tons contained in the 334 federal coal lease is 11,484.4. The Green River-Hams Fork region contains 664.4 million tons, or 5.7% percent, and Wyoming contains 379.4 million tons, or 3.3% percent.

DEMAND FOR COAL RESOURCES

While the precise rate of demand is unknown, there is little question that the Nation's overall energy requirements will continue to grow. New technologies and energy forms are still unproven and cannot be relied upon over the next decade or so. In the next decade, the United States will be forced to address the problem of providing energy demands largely through a combination of three basic types of actions. These actions would be to--

1. expand use of coal as a domestic energy source,
2. obtain increased foreign supplies of oil and gas, and
3. curb demands by greater energy conservation measures.

Accordingly, the Department of the Interior (DOI) requested that the Department of Energy (DOE) provide a set of coal production projections. These projections for 1985 and 1990 were developed by the DOE Leasing Policy Development Office and were submitted in a report to the DOI in June 1978.

Table 3-2 shows the DOE national coal consumption projections for 1985 and 1990 by types of use.

TABLE 3-2
NATIONAL COAL CONSUMPTION
(million tons)

CONSUMING SECTOR	1977	1985			1990		
		LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
Electric Utility	475	692.4	759.5	816.1	772.4	1,007.1	1,276.7
Industrial	60	109.1	158.7	158.1	138.2	279.4	279.3
Metallurgical	77	96.1	96.2	96.2	100.0	100.0	100.1
Residential/Commerical	7	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.7	0.7	0.7
Synthetics	--	13.1	22.5	41.3	26.3	56.2	122.1
Exports	54	72.5	73.7	73.6	76.3	77.2	77.1
TOTAL	673	984.7	1,112.1	1,186.8	1,113.9	1,520.6	1,856.0

Source: Federal Coal Management Program DES, 1978.

Under assumptions of medium use, consumption of coal by utilities is projected to rise by 60 percent (from 475 to 760 million tons per year) between 1977 and 1985. The other main increase in coal consumption is in the industrial sector, where coal use is projected to grow by 98.7 million tons (from 60 million tons in 1977 to 159 million tons in 1985). Total coal consumption for 1985 is projected at 1.11 billion tons under medium level assumptions.

The medium level increase in national coal production projected between 1985 and 1990 is 37 percent. Most of this increase is due to greater use of coal by utilities. Industrial coal use nas a more rapid rate of growth than utilities, but the increase is considerably less in absolute amount.

Table 3-3 shows DOE production projections for the western coal regions selected for assessment.

TABLE 3-3
DOE PRODUCTION PROJECTIONS FOR WESTERN COAL REGIONS
(million tons)

COAL REGION	1985 PROJECTION			1990 PROJECTION		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
Western Interior	8.9	10.6	10.9	9.6	10.3	9.6
Fort Union	18.4	20.0	23.4	21.9	20.6	34.5
Powder River	140.4	204.6	232.1	173.7	396.1	602.9
Green River-Hams Fork	89.9	112.0	128.8	105.9	149.5	177.7
Uinta-Southwestern Utah	25.7	26.4	26.3	25.1	28.3	27.9
San Juan River	20.1	22.8	22.9	34.5	58.4	72.5
Denver Raton Mesa	5.3	5.3	5.2	5.4	6.8	6.6
Texas	57.7	57.7	57.7	62.3	79.6	104.1
TOTAL1	366.4	459.4	507.3	438.4	749.6	1,035.8

1. Excludes production from Arizona, Washington, and Alaska.

Note: The DOE estimates have been revised slightly for purposes of this table.

Source: Federal Coal Management Program DES, 1978.

By 1985, coal production west of the Mississippi River is projected to reach 42 percent of the national total (medium assumptions). By 1990, projected western production would reach 50 percent of the national total, corresponding roughly to the percentage of reserves located in the west.

The Northern Great Plains (Wyoming, Montana, and North Dakota, essentially) would become the largest single producing section of the country if DOE projections were realized. By 1990, Northern Great Plains coal production would exceed both Appalachain and Midwestern production and would constitute 36 percent of national production. Assuming medium consumption levels, production of 112 million tons per year in 1985 and 150 million tons per year in 1990 is projected for the Green River-Hams Fork Coal Region, or 24 and 20 percent, respectively, of total western production projected for these years.

The development of western coal has been stimulated by the greater ease with which low sulfur coal can meet air quality standards, creating a demand in the East for western coal. However, the most important sources of increased demand for western coal are in the West, itself. In Table 3-4, the DOE projected transportation of western-produced coal to eastern and western consumption regions is shown.

TABLE 3-4
EASTERN AND WESTERN CONSUMPTION OF WESTERN COAL
(million tons)

	1985			1990		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
western coal consumed in the East	74.0	87.3	93.0	75.6	136.0	299.0
western coal consumed in the West	306.4	384.7	426.9	378.2	627.3	750.4
TOTAL WESTERN COAL	380.4	472.0	519.9	453.8	763.3	1,049.4

Source: Federal Coal Management Program DES, 1978.

Overall for both 1985 and 1990 medium forecasts, 18 percent of western production is projected to be consumed in the East and Midwest. Under DOE's 1990 high assumptions, which involve low transportation costs, less strict sulfur scrubbing requirements, higher labor costs, and other assumptions designed to promote western production, 299 million tons per year of western coal would move to the East.

IMPACT OF THE UNSUITABLE DESIGNATION

The Green River-Hams Fork region is composed of two contiguous coal regions covering 37,500 square miles of extreme western Wyoming and northwestern Colorado, with small portions in Utah and Idaho. By using the conversion factor of 1 square mile equals 640 acres, 37,500 square miles equals 24,000,000 acres. This acreage figure does not reflect acreages underlain by workable coal deposits.

Table 3-5 shows the distribution of coal and surface ownership within the Green River-Hams Fork region.

TABLE 3-5
KRCRA COAL AND SURFACE OWNERSHIP
(acres)

REGION AND KRCRA	PUBLIC DOMAIN SURFACE FEDERAL COAL	PUBLIC DOMAIN SURFACE NONFEDERAL COAL	PRIVATE PRIVATE SURFACE FEDERAL COAL	PRIVATE PRIVATE SURFACE NONFEDERAL COAL
Green River-Hams Fork Region				
Wyoming KRCRAs				
Hanna-Carbon Basin	85,493	160	6,454	116,367
Kemmerer	105,260		18,053	125,751
Rawlins	49,863	40	16,155	48,761
Red Desert	453,267	640	7,834	309,076
Rock Springs	430,487	120	7,739	312,905
Total	1,124,370	960	56,235	912,860
Colorado KRCRAs				
McCallum	18,400	240	5,040	15,120
Yampa	36,970	3,640	269,300	101,675
Total	55,370	3,880	274,340	116,795
TOTAL GREEN RIVER-HAMS FORK REGION	1,179,740	4,840	330,575	1,029,655

The Green River-Hams Fork region contains 1,179,740 acres which are federal surface/federal coal which is 4.9 percent of the total 24,000,000 acres contained within the region. The federal surface/nonfederal coal contains 4,840 acres, or 0.02 percent of the total 24,000,000 acres contained within the region. There are 330,575 acres that are private surface/federal coal, or 1.37 percent of the total 24,000,000 acres within the region. The private surface/non-federal coal acres contain 1,029,655, or 4.29 percent of the total 24,000,000 acres contained within the region.

Impact of Designation on Supply of Coal

When dealing with coal, one must remember the term "resources" describes the estimated total amount of coal for which economic extraction could eventually become feasible. Whereas, the coal "reserve" is that limited portion of the resource which is judged to be minable at a profit under existing market conditions. The total identified coal resource of the United States is estimated to be 1.7 trillion tons. Of this coal, only 438 billion tons have thus far been identified with enough certainty and sufficient economically viable prospects to be included in the reserve category (Federal Coal Management Program DES, 1978).

The total estimated coal reserve base and 1976 production for the Green River-Hams Fork region are shown in Table 3-6.

TABLE 3-6
Estimated Coal Reserve Base and 1976 Production
Green River/Hams Fork Region

Reserve Base (million tons)			Production 1976 (thousand tons)		
deep	surface	total	deep	surface	total
13,396	2,147	15,543	768	24,916	25,684

Source: Federal Coal Management Program DES, 1978.

Of the total reserves in the West, the Green River-Hams Fork region contains 7 percent of the reserve base.

ESTIMATED VALUE ON SITE-SPECIFIC BASIS FOR RED RIM-CHINA BUTTE

The Red Rim-China Butte review area contains 88,700 acres of which 40,700 acres are federal. Of the total 40,700 federal acres, there are 40,700 acres that are unleased. There are 45,060 acres that are private and 2,940 acres that are state-owned.

Table 3-7 shows the breakdown of acreages within the Red Rim-China Butte review area.

TABLE 3-7
SURFACE OWNERSHIP
RED RIM-CHINA BUTTE REVIEW AREA
(in acres)

BLM Administered (unleased)	Private	State	Total
40,700	45,060	2,940	88,700

The unsuitability criteria were applied to the 40,700 unleased federal acres as per instructions from the Secretary. Table 3-8 shows the breakdown of the acreages and tons of coal underlying these acres by unsuitability criteria.

TABLE 3-8
Unsuitability Determinations

Category	Acres	Tons of Coal*
Unsuitable acres by criteria	646	3,662,174
Acceptable pending study	24,092	136,577,548
Acceptable with inventory needs	15,182	86,066,758
Acceptable with no likely problems	780	4,421,820
TOTAL	40,700	230,728,300

*Assuming an average of 5,669 tons/acre derived from USGS CRO/CDP coal maps and considering only the high and moderate development potential coal that is strippable to 200 feet and coal beds that are greater than or equal to 5 feet in thickness.

Table 3-9 shows the breakdown of acres by unsuitability criteria after exceptions:

TABLE 3-9
RED RIM-CHINA BUTTE REVIEW AREA

Criterion	Unsuitable	Acceptable pending study	Acceptable with inventory needs	Acceptable with no problems
1	-0-	-0-	-0-	40,700
2	-0-	-0-	-0-	40,700
3	46	-0-	-0-	40,654
4	-0-	-0-	-0-	40,700
5	-0-	-0-	-0-	40,700
6	10	-0-	-0-	40,690
7	620	-0-	40,080	-0-
8	-0-	-0-	-0-	40,700
9	-0-	-0-	14,400	26,300
10	Criterion was not applied			
11	150	1,750	-0-	38,800
12	-0-	-0-	40,700	-0-
13	-0-	5,239	-0-	35,461
14	-0-	15,287	3,455	21,958
15	-0-	16,788	23,912	-0-
16	34	90	40,576	-0-
17	3,530	1,216	-0-	35,954
18	-0-	-0-	-0-	40,700
19	-0-	-0-	-0-	40,700
20	Criterion was not applied			
21	Criterion was not applied			
22	-0-	360	-0-	40,340
23	200	12,559	-0-	27,941
24	Criterion was not applied			

Note: The totals of the unsuitability criteria breakdown are not significant as individual criterion areas may have overlap with other criteria.

Table 3-10 shows the estimated revenue to be derived, total unsuitable acres to be affected, and the range of estimated market values of coal.

TABLE 3-10
RED RIM-CHINA BUTTE REVIEW AREA

	Tons*	Acres	Estimated Values** $16.00	$18.00	$20.00
Total Federal	230,728,300	40,700	$3,691,652,800	$4,153,109,400	$4,614,566,000
Total Unsuitable	3,662,174	646	$58,594,784	$65,919,132	$73,243,480

	Tons*	Acres	@ 12.5% Minimum Royalty*** $16.00	$18.00	$20.00
Total Federal	230,728,300	40,700	$461,456,600	$519,138,675	$576,820,750
Total Unsuitable	3,662,174	646	$7,324,348	$8,239,891.5	$9,155,435

*Estimated coal tonnages obtained from USGS CRO/CDP maps for high and moderate development potential coal that is strippable to 200 feet and coal beds that are greater than or equal to 5 feet in thickness and the average tons per acre to be 5,669 derived from 230,728,300 tons divided by 40,700 acres.

**Personal communication by W. Stiles with Mr. A.M. Hannum of Energy Development Corporation of Hanna, Wyoming, March 24, 1979.

***Assuming this is the minimum royalty rate to the federal government.

Table 3-11 shows the tonnage figures obtained from USGS CRO/DCP open file reports. These tonnage figures were used to obtain the average tons per acre figure used in calculating tonnages for each criterion.

TABLE 3-11
RED RIM-CHINA BUTTE
REVIEW AREA

	High Development Potential		Moderate Development Potential		Tons*
Seaverson Reservoir	38,380,000	+	3,550,000	=	41,390,000
Riner	38,420,000	+	11,050,000	=	49,470,000
Fillmore Ranch	40,200,000	+	14,030,000	=	54,230,000
Creston Junction	43,560,000	+	12,160,000	=	55,720,000
Rawlins Peak SW	3,780,000	+	1,790,000	=	5,570,000
Rawlins Peak SE	90,000	+	80,000	=	170,000
Bridger Pass SW	5,290,000	+	1,850,000	=	7,140,000
Bridger Pass NW	11,240,000	+	5,250,000	=	16,490,000
TOTAL	180,960,000	+	49,760,000	=	230,720,000

*230,728,300 Tons of High and Moderate Development Potential Coal
40,700 Federal Unleased Acres

$$\frac{230,728,300}{40,700} = 5,669 \text{ tons/acre average}$$

APPENDIX 1

PUBLIC COMMENTS

PUBLIC MEETING

COAL DEVELOPMENT -- HANNA BASIN and RED RIM -- CHINA BUTTE

RAWLINS DISTRICT

Introduction

Fred Wolf - Rawlins District Manager

Planning Process and Unsuitability Criteria

Jack Kelly - Chief, Division of Resources

Proposals for Hanna Basin Area

Floyd Ewing - Medicine Bow Area Manager

Proposals for Red Rim - China Butte Area

Ron Wenker - Divide Area Manager

Question and Answer Period

Public Statements

Introduction

Welcome to this public meeting on coal development planning. Since the spring of 1977, the Department of the Interior has been working to develop a new Federal Coal Management Program. This program development effort is now well along with a decision by the Secretary on the final form of the program scheduled for early June 1979.

The planning process which we will be reviewing tonight is an integral part of this developmental effort. The areas we are going to discuss include 100,000 acres of known coal resource lands located in Carbon County and the eastern edge of Sweetwater County. The areas specifically include 60,000 acres in the Hanna Basin and 40,000 acres in the Red Rim/China Butte area southwest of Rawlins.

Land use decisions defining coal development were previously developed for these federal lands in 1977. Since then, the Secretary of the Interior has developed interim criteria for determining lands as unsuitable for coal development. The proposed revisions included in the handout "Supplement to Wyoming Land Use Decisions", were developed through application of these criteria to the 1977 decisions.

In this public meeting Jack Kelly, our Chief of Resources, will explain the planning process under which we are reviewing coal planning decisions and the succeeding steps leading to selection of tracts for possible lease if the Secretary of the Interior decides to lease coal at a future date.

Next on the agenda, Floyd Ewing and Ron Wenker, the Area Managers for the Medicine Bow and Divide Resource Areas will present our proposed coal planning decisions for Hanna Basin and the Red Rim/China Butte areas. They will explain specifics as to why coal resource lands were declared unsuitable or acceptable for coal development. You may ask questions at any time during the presentations.

After all questions are answered we will take oral or written statements. You may comment on the unsuitability criteria, the application of the criteria, or the proposed decisions. Your comments can be submitted at this meeting or sent to us prior to March 26.

Considering your input, we will make final recommendations to the Director, BLM, regarding revision of our current land use decisions involving coal for these 100,000 acres.

We would like to emphasize the following points regarding this planning process:

a. The proposed land use decisions before you are based on the draft unsuitability criteria. These criteria are now under review by the Department to determine their final form.

b. One of the purposes of this effort is to test and evaluate the draft criteria. These test results will be used by the Department in formulating the final criteria.

c. The final MFP supplements, which will not be approved until after June 1, will be made consistent with final criteria as decided by the Secretary.

d. If requested by any person who may be adversely affected by the plan, a hearing will be held as required by the Coal Leasing Amendments Act and 43 CFR 3525.11(c) and (d), before the supplement is approved.

We welcome any questions or statements regarding the proposals which you have in hand and as explained here tonight.

Phil Espy, Blake Sheep Company

I would like to make a statement about the winter habitat on Red Rim (on Blake Ranch) I don't believe it. The antelope come towards town and they also go south on Red Rim. That can be the most severist places in that country, is what I'm trying to say. If its a good winter anything can winter anyplace, if its bad you can't get in there with a snow cat.

Response (Wenker)

Phil the area that we identified was the area that we feel is most critical area in the most severe storms. That doesn't mean they couldn't winter further towards Atlantic Rim, Rawlins, or scatter out.

Clark Bolser - Rocky Mountain Energy Company

Written Statement

John McPherson - Lawyer

I represent the land owner who owns the chekerboard area within what is designated as the Atlantic Rim - China Butte area, or at least a major portion of the deeded properties within that area. I do not have a especially prepared written statement, I would intend to submit that before the 26, but there are some comments that with your indulgence I would like to make this evening for the purposes of the record. We feel that the criteria fails to really address the unique situation presented by the checkerboard land pattern. Implementation of criteria as proposed and as applied in this particular situation in the case of the Red Rim - China Butte area fails to give proper consideration to the alternate federally owned private ownership found within that area. We feel that the criteria implementation

of that criteria, as done in this instance, was primarily designed to deal with large tracts of federally owned property, where federal minerals were involved, and was not really designed or addressed to the situation which we have here and that is of course the checkerboard ownership. The area contains (according to Mr. Wenker) 230 million tons of economically recoverable and marketable coal with high development potential. But I would submit to you gentlemen, that since his figures relate only to the federal lands, that instead of 230 million tons of coal we are really talking about 460 million tons of coal. Economically recoverable with high development potential. I say this to you because we are not talking just about what is going to occur on the federal lands, 230 million tons, but I'm talking about all of the lands out there, because without question what is done on the federal lands will have some effect on what is done on the private lands. Because of this unique land pattern, as I say it is readily apparent what is done on the federal lands will have some effect as to what is done on the private lands. As a representative of Mr. Lawrence, I find myself and he finds himself in a very unique dilemma, he has historically used that property for a viable ranching operation. As the gentlemen in the local office know, he turns his steers out on the area, on which the potential coal development could take place, in the spring and then moves his cattle further south in the summer. If the area is closed to coal development on the federal sections, its certainly possible the development of the coal resources could take place on the private sections. He is not the mineral owner of the private sections, that of course is owned by Rocky Mountain Energy. If this were to occur then certaintly his ranch operations would be significantly affected. Having gone through that he then faces the possibility of a reexamine of criteria on the federal level which has to be admittedly possible in light of the change from the MFP findings and the present findings at which point and time they are going to go in and mine the federal minerals which again interrupts his ranch operations. We feel that because of the intermingling of private and federal lands that a joint effort between federal ownership and private surface ownership and private mineral ownership should be affected. A joint effort to assure (1) development of energy related resource; (2) protection of wildlife habitat and (3) proper reclamation. We heard what criteria were applied and why this particular area was not acceptable, air quality, reclamation, wildlife; I would submit to you that these are all issues addressed by the OSM, federal regulations, and by the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality. Both of these entities have proven themselves more than capable and more than being well equipped to handle this type of a problem. Failure to affect a cooperative effort among all those involved will have really an adverse interest, it will result in a hopscotch type of development. We are concerned about reclamation, as a land owner we're properly concerned because that land to us is a viable ranching operation. And yet we also recognize that in this point and time in our society with energy the demand of energy in America any decision not to develop such a viable natural resource should be carefully monitored. In listening here this evening, I get the feeling, and I come away with the impression, that one of the major reasons for classifying that area in the manner that it was classified was for the protection of wildlife, but let me submit to you gentlemen what could concievably happen if joint effort is not affected, Mr. Lawerence could infact fence the deeded lands, if infact he fences the deeded lands, that would affect the wildlife unquestionably. And I would submit to you that the wildlife then being affected, you would have no other alternative but to come in and reapply your criteria to that situation. And I would submit to you that you would come away with a different result. Thats why I urge you and suggest to you that joint effort among those entities, that I suggested, should be effected. I would further submit that the time for comment and the time for input from the land owner has not been sufficient. I'm not saying that we were denied by the local office to come out and discuss this with you, but frankley we haven't had a opportunity to do that. Today is the first time that we've really been able to sit down and discuss and to make our feelings known and to find out some of the input from the BLM, so I would submit to you that the time implementation from the land owner is not sufficient. We own every other section out there and the decision that you make is going to very-very significantly affect our use of that land. I would also remind you that we hold the grazing leases on those sections, and yet we haven't been contacted nor has the situation been discussed with us until today. I would submit too, that what should be done in this instance, if something must infact be done, that the area of Atlantic Rim and China Butte be classified as acceptable pending further study, with reference made to fish and wildlife, some type of an implementation of a plan with them, all of this data should be acquired before its categorically stated that this area is unsuitable. I would submit to you, and we feel that the material as proposed cannot be defended in court, and after all as I understand it, this is the directive under which the criteria was to be developed and implemented and certainly it's the ultimate test. Thank you very much.

Ed Ziolkowski - Energy Development Company

I am Vice President and General Manager of Energy Development Company of Hanna, Wyoming. Energy Development Company is a wholly owned subsidiary of Iowa Public Service Company of Sioux City, Iowa. We currently operate both deep and strip mines in the Hanna Basin. I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the proposed Management Framework Plan revision presented by the Bureau of Land Management.

Of particular interest to our company is the Overland unit consisting of the Red Rim and China Butte area. This area has been under study by Energy Development and our proposed joint venture partner, Rocky Mountain Energy, since early 1975. When the call for nominations was requested we submitted to the BLM, those lands which we wanted to have considered for leasing and we also submitted a preliminary mine plan which shows not only the broad surface mining area but also the reclamation plan. We have spent a large sum of money based on these nominations and been led to think that they could be expedited, the nominations and leases could be expedited. In fact, jointly we've spent over 3/4 of a million dollars, doing various studies such as wildlife, vegetation, hydrology studies, and so forth. This data was submitted to the Bureau of Land Management for their regional ES statement. We have also entered into a cooperative drilling program as the requirement of the United States Geological Survey, requesting participation in a drilling program, in which we and Rocky Mountain Energy again expended money to do some extensive drilling to complete a mine plan and reclamation study for this area. We are now told that because of the establishment of the 24 point "unsuitability criteria" this entire logical mining unit has been withdrawn from consideration by the secretary thus eliminating, by BLM figures, 230 million tons, or as eluded to by Mr.

MacPherson possible double that, or more. This is all surface minable coal. This is at a time when other federal agencies are pleading for energy independence. With an oil crisis again on the horizon all over world, this would seem to be counter productive, and a very poor time to be withdrawaing from consideration any proven minable energy resources.

We consider this criteria to be very vague, yet all encompassing. I dare say that by following the 24 point criteria, there is not an acre of federally owned ground anywhere in the U.S.-that by some stretch of the imagination-could not be classified as unsuitable for development.

Now let's look at some of these criteria's and how loosely they are written, and how much latitude is given to the individual making the determination.

First let's look at No. 5 "Scenic Areas". What are scenic areas to me, may not be at all scenic to someone else and vice versa. Yet someone is being put into a position of saying O.K. I call it scenic so you cannot mine a given area. This puts tremendous power in the hands of one man or one group with absolutely no recourse to the industry.

Second, let's take No. 8, "Natural Areas". Now a natural area to me, would mean an area that has not been disturbed by man during the recorded history of mankind. The west is big, but I can not conceive that sometime in the last 5 to 6,000 years man has not crossed every square inch of this land. If he left traces of his presence, this would be of greater concern, and I would agree, but I prefer to live in the future - not in the past.

Lastly, lets look at criteria No. 13, the "Falcon Cliff Nesting Sites". The criteria says that these areas may be mined by leaving a quarter mile radius area around such sites. First of all, leaving such an area in a pit would create unbelievable operation problems and would cause the loss of the resource far outside the quarter mile radius, because of the slope of the overburden on all sides.

I think it is time the general public is made aware of such losses and what it is actually costing them every time they flip a light switch on, for the consumer is the one who is paying - not the falcon.

Take this case as an example. If we consider only the quarter mile radius, since the area would be greater or larger at greater depths, and consider a multiple seam situation which contains 20 feet of coal. This would mean that this one falcon, which I am certain could be temporarily displaced, is worth 4,000,000 tons of coal. If you care to carry this further, consider an average sales price of coal at $20.00 per ton, this means 80 million dollars on which all taxes are lost, employment is lost, and the price of electricity has risen, if indeed it is available.

This energy source is sorely needed to produce power for the farm and industrial areas of our nation. You may be sure that these areas would be diligently developed, for none of us can afford to tie up capital for land and machinery and not get a return on our investment as soon as possible.

We have been told that wildlife biologists from BLM and the Game & Fish commission agree that this area is very essential to the winter range, and I might agree if the entire area was active at any one time, but when one considers that the maximum of disturbed lands, or 200 acres, would be active in any given year it seems a small price to pay for badly needed fuel.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Barbara Parsons - Citizen

The BLM seems to be taking a much more conservative approach then they did initially, this is very pleasing to me. Our national priorities on coal leasing are putting a great deal of pressure on BLM to release land for leasing. However, when many of our western values are being affected by mining, some of them irreversibily so, it seems prudent to be conservative. Time may provide alternative game management plans, better rehabilitation of land surface and other possible energy sources, but until that time it's refreashing to see a government agency showing responsive action to environmental concerns. Especially when faced by intense industrial pressure. Thank you gentlemen.

Teno Roncalio - U.S. Congressman (Retired)

I'm a retired Congressman and attorney and I speak in no one's interest but my own, this evening although I have friends who are in industry, and friends who are in environmental and friends who are land owners in this area. First I want to commend you, as the lady did just now, for your high degree of professionalism which we in Congress imposed upon you. We said to you, you do this as professionalists and biologists and give us some straight answers. That you have done, that we commend you for. What I think I have to say of some importance is this, and I say it as the author of what is sometimes called the Roncalio language on surface owner protection, as a man who fought to amend the endangered species act last fall, to make sure that if the contributions of the Grey Rocks Reservoir were impairing the life of Whooping Cranes then it should be permanently injoined, but that if it was not making any endangerment to the species of the Whooping Cranes then it should be permitted, that was my amendment. And I've done many other things, that you'll work with, over the years. I commend you for the work you're doing and I commend you for the expertise in this. I plead with you, from a level that looks at national and international problems, to see if we can't, with this problem, to come up with something that proves that the environmental world and industrial world can work hand in hand to solve delicate difficult problems. There is no question but what this is a critical antelope habitat. Is it the most critical habitat for following classification 15, I don't know. In 1949, there was a terrible imbarrassment in Wyoming by the result of the dead antelope along the northern strip of this, along the railroad tracks. Pictures appeared in national magazines, the state of Wyoming was severely critized by the Game and Fish Department for allowing these deaths of the pronghorns by the thousands, which happened that year because that was a horrible winter. So these things we know must not reoccur. Is it not possible, in this event, for you to state to your directors and the Secretary of Interior and to Mr. Craig, this area we believe can be managed for full protection of antelopes and allow some resource development because of its vital contribution to the well being of us all. This shall not be some new type of feed. With fencing with this protection, with stronger prohibition against firearms in a mining area, with this type of contribution can your work be made safe for those antelope and can the coal be mined. I'd like to think you can do that. If you can make those recommendations and allow the mining in an orderly way without damage to this particular herd, you'd be doing the world a favor and especially you'd be doing America a truly great favor because the most important function today is to prove to everybody in America that there can be sensible development of our resources and sensible protection of our environment and atmosphere hand in hand. I believe that

VISITOR'S ROSTER

DATES ARRIVAL	DATES DEPARTURE	NAME	OFFICE ADDRESS	PURPOSE
3/14/79	3/15/79	MONTE G. JORDAN	OFFICE OF COAL MGTMENT WASHINGTON, D.C.	PARTICIPATE IN PUBLIC MEETING ON MFP UPDATES
3/14/79	"	ANDREW L. TARSHIS	WSO	"
3/14/79		Joel A. Strid	Carbon County Coal Co. Hanna, Wyo.	
3/14/79		Marion Loomis	Wyo. Mining Assoc. Box 866 Cheyenne, Wyo	
3/14		Tom Roncalio	Self 3024 Capitol Ave Cheyenne, Wyo	U.S. Congressman Retired
3/14/79		JOE PATTI	WSO	PARTICIPATE IN UNSUITABILITY OPEN HOUSE / PUBLIC MTG.
3/14/79		CLARK BOLSER	ROCKY MTN ENERGY CO.	
3/14/79		James Medina	Rep U.S Sen Simpson 601 N Front Rock Springs	
3/14/79		Artie Scibelli	Carbon Co Council of Govts Box 1836 Rawlins, Wyo	obtain more information for dissemination to COG gen. membership
7:00 PM 3/14/79		Robert Hettinger	Denver Federal Center MS 602 U.S. Geol Survey	Observer
3/14/79		C.E. Timmons	USGS DFC Denver	Observer.
3/14/79		Neil Bivens	USGS DFC Denver	Observer

USGI-BLM Form 1100-1 (June 1971)

Fred Wolf (District Manager)

Do we have any other statements? If not I would urge those of you who have not made an oral statement to submit your comments in writing to reach us by March 26, 1979. If we have no further statements this public meeting is closed.

can be done, I hope you can come up with the same thing. Thank you very much.

Evening Session VISITOR'S ROSTER

DATES ARRIVAL	DATES DEPARTURE	NAME	OFFICE ADDRESS	PURPOSE
		Davy Anderson	Coyote Canyon	
		Victor Anderson	Coyote Canyon, Wyo.	
		A. J. Weise	Medicine Bow	
		CLARK BOLSER	ROCKY MTN ENERGY CO. DENVER, COLO.	MAKE STATEMENT,
		Joe Spencer	411 Jefferson Rawlins, Wyo	
		Bob Sims	Savery Wyo	
		C2 Hunt	3cc Hunt Bldg Billings Mont	
		Robert H. Berg	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Cheyenne	Listen
		M. Taylor Kramm Jr	Casper Wyoming Hall Ave Exit 6	
		Stop Sun	" "	
		[illegible] Crosby	Lake Shop	
		James Medina	U.S. Sen. Simpson	

USDI-BLM Form 1100-1 June 1971)

Evening Session VISITOR'S ROSTER

DATES ARRIVAL	DATES DEPARTURE	NAME	OFFICE ADDRESS	PURPOSE
3/N/79		Stanley Sandberg	USGS; MS 602 DFC Denver	Observer
3/14/79		John Dimas	BLM, Rawlins District	
3/14/79		Bruce Waddell	BLM Rawlins District	
3/14-79		Tom Howard	Rawlins Daily Times	
3/14/79		John A. Pearson	Box 999 Rawlins	
3/14/79		Barbara W. Parsons	519 W. Larson Rawlins	
3/14/79		Bill Iverson	Carbon Co Planning Rawlins	
3/14/79		Ed Ziolkowski	Box 600, Energy Dev. Co. Hanna Wyo 82327	
3/14/79		Arnold Hannum	Energy Development Box 600 Hanna	
3/14/79		NORMAN PALM	Ecl Mtn. Wyo.	
3/14/79		Georgia McDonald	1822 Mc Donald #2 Rawlins, Wyo	
3/14/79		James McDonald	" "	

USDI-BLM Form 1100-1 (June 1971)



Mr. Fred Wolf
March 21, 1979
Page 2

RECEIVED
MAR 26 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

you have received clarification from Washington regarding the application of the unsuitability criteria. One instance of particular interest is the protection of wildlife populations, which need not be protected totally, but only in part. This opens the question of mitigation measures, or at least coal development in parts of areas which would be wholly excluded if the criterion were applied strictly. Since this Washington directive apparently alters the ground rules that were in force when you first prepared the supplements, I am interested in learning what changes in the supplements, if any, you will make.

Without the answers to these three questions, it is difficult, if not impossible, to effectively review the supplements. Your comment deadline of March 26, therefore, seems premature, and I think it would be appropriate to extend the deadline pending a detailed response from you.

Yours sincerely,

Ed Herschler

EH/amt

cc: Mr. Guy Martin, Assistant Secretary for Land and Water, USDI
Mr. Daniel Baker, State Director, BLM
Mr. John Watson, WIEB

WYOMING
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT
CHEYENNE

ED HERSCHLER
GOVERNOR

RECEIVED
MAR 26 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

March 21, 1979

Mr. Fred Wolf
District Manager
Bureau of Land Management
Rawlins District
P. O. Box 670
Rawlins, WY 82301

Dear Mr. Wolf:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the supplements to the Hanna and Overland Management Framework Plans. The supplements, which apply the twenty-four coal unsuitability criteria, are a major step in the emerging federal coal management program. As you may know, the state would play a major role in the Secretary's preferred alternative program, and I have accordingly taken a personal interest in its implementation.

My review of the two supplements raises at least three serious questions.

First, the supplements convey no sense of either the quality or range of the data used to apply the unsuitability criteria. I have consistently questioned Interior's ability to apply adequate resources to the tasks created by the proposed program, and I do not find my doubts relieved by supplements in hand. They are inscrutable when it comes to determining the level of Interior's effort. This is precisely what concerned me for many months; and I believe that the situation must be rectified before it becomes a source of contention in the months ahead.

Second, although there are references in the supplements to unsuitability criteria which involve the state (criteria 15 and 23), I have no idea how you have secured the state's position in reaching your conclusions. You certainly have not consulted with me. It is my understanding that the new program's procedures for tract ranking and selection will directly involve a representative of my choosing. It seems only sensible that I should also be consulted on the application of unsuitability criteria.

Third, I understand that since I received the supplements

THE STATE OF WYOMING

ED HERSCHLER
GOVERNOR

Department of Environmental Quality

Water Quality Division

HATHAWAY BUILDING

CHEYENNE, WYOMING 82002

TELEPHONE 307 777 7781

RECEIVED
MAR 26 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

MEMORANDUM

To: Robert E. Sundin, Director
Department of Environmental Quality

From: Frank R. Harman, Environmental Engineer
Water Quality Division

Date: March 19, 1979

Subject: Proposed supplement to Wyoming Land Use Decisions for determination of unsuitability for coal development in the Hanna and Overland areas, Rawlins District, State of Wyoming

The above mentioned documents cover revisions to the coal development plans in the Red Rim-China Buttes and Hanna Basin areas in the Rawlins District of the State of Wyoming.

Area descriptions and classifications are dealt with. The unsuitable and acceptable areas are demarcated for the development of coal.

No environmental impact study is included in either of the studies and the general nature of the study does not warrant any comments from the Water Quality Division at this time.

FRH/nc

THE STATE OF WYOMING

ED HERSCHLER
GOVERNOR

Wyoming Recreation Commission

OFFICE OF THE WYOMING STATE ARCHEOLOGIST

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
LARAMIE, WYOMING 82071

UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
TELEPHONE: 766-6334

JAN L. WILSON
Acting Director
777-7695

March 8, 1979

COMMISSION OFFICERS
REGNALD BAFFORD
PRESIDENT
P.O. Box 625
Lusk 82225
DUANE REDMAN
VICE PRESIDENT
Dubois 82513
E. LAWSON SCHWOPE
TREASURER
900 Fayer Avenue
Cheyenne 82001
MEMBERS
FLOYD BARTLING
P.O. Box 172
Douglas 82633
LYLE BENTZEN
1001 Pioneer Road
Sheridan 82801
MRS. ROBERT FRISBY
2007 Newton Avenue
Cody 82414
MARVIN HARSHMAN
1607 West Spruce
Rawlins 82301
JACK D. OSMOND
P.O. Box 216
Thayne 83127
ALBERT PILCH
1800 Morse Lee
Evanston 82930

There is not enough known about archeological resources in these areas to make this kind of decision.

RECEIVED
MAR 26 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

DANIEL N. MILLER, JR.
DIRECTOR AND
STATE GEOLOGIST
DEPUTY DIRECTOR AND
STAFF GEOLOGIST
GARY B. GLASS
STAFF GEOLOGISTS
RODNEY H. DE BRUIN
W. DAN HAUSEL
DAVID R. LAGESON
ALAN J. VER PLOEG
TECHNICAL EDITOR
DAVID A. COPELAND

MAR 7 1979

TELEPHONES
(307) 742 2054
(307) 766 2286

THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF WYOMING
UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
BOX 3008, UNIVERSITY STATION
LARAMIE, WYOMING 82071

Serving Wyoming Since 1933

SURVEY ADVISORY BOARD
D. L. BLACKSTONE, JR. LARAMIE
A. THOMAS GRAHAM, JR. GREEN
EDMUND L. (ROY) HEISEY CASPER
ROBERT S. HOUSTON, LARAMIE
BAYARD D. REA CASPER

March 5, 1979

RECEIVED
MAR 26 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

Mr. Steve Freudenthal
State Planning Coordinator
Wyoming State Clearinghouse
2320 Capitol Avenue
Cheyenne, WY 82002

Dear Mr. Freudenthal:

Mr. Gary B. Glass, Deputy Director/Coal Specialist has reviewed the Hanna and Overland Management Framework Plan Supplements (I.D. No. 79-112P). He has made several comments, which are attached. These are the only comments we have to make at this time.

If your office or another agency would like us to reexamine any part of this report for any specific purpose, please don't hesitate to ask.

Sincerely,

Rodney H. De Bruin

Rodney H. De Bruin
Staff Geologist

RHD:mm
Enclosures: 2

THE STATE OF WYOMING

ED HERSCHLER
GOVERNOR

Wyoming Recreation Commission

604 EAST 25TH STREET
CHEYENNE, WYOMING 82002

JAN L. WILSON
Director
777-7695

March 5, 1979

RECEIVED
MAR 26 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

COMMISSION OFFICERS
REGNALD BAFFORD
PRESIDENT
P.O. Box 625
Lusk 82225
MRS. ROBERT FRISBY
VICE PRESIDENT
2007 Newton Drive
Cody 82414
E. LAWSON SCHWOPE
TREASURER
900 Fayer Avenue
Cheyenne 82001
MEMBERS
FLOYD BARTLING
P.O. Box 172
Douglas 82633
MARVIN HARSHMAN
1607 West Spruce
Rawlins 82301
WILLIAM MOFFAT
107 W. Jackson Avenue
Riverton 82501
JACK D. OSMOND
P.O. Box 216
Thayne 83127
ALBERT PILCH
1800 Morse Lee
Evanston 82930

Mr. Richard Hartman
State Planning Coordinator
2320 Capitol Avenue
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

Dear Mr. Hartman:

The Historical Section of the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Office has received your memorandum of February 28, 1979, and accompanying "Hanna and Overland Management Framework Plan Supplements" (79-112P).

Our staff appreciates the opportunity to comment upon this management plan regarding potential impact upon cultural resources. After reviewing our inventories and other pertinent historical sources, I find no sites either enrolled in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places within those areas designated for leasing subject to environmental statement. However, since these supplements are only general management plans, our staff will await future site specific statements before recommending cultural clearance.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment. I am pleased to the see that the Bureau of Land Management by including "Historic Lands and Sites" within its Unsuitability Criteria acknowledges the importance of identifying and saving Wyoming's cultural resources.

Cordially,

Jan L. Wilson, Director and
State Historic Preservation Officer

by: Greg Kendrick
Review and Compliance Officer

JLW:GDK:klm

Geology--Interpreting the past to provide for the future

DANIEL N. MILLER, JR.
DIRECTOR AND
STATE GEOLOGIST
DEPUTY DIRECTOR AND
STAFF GEOLOGIST
GARY B. GLASS
STAFF GEOLOGISTS
RODNEY H. DE BRUIN
W. DAN HAUSEL
DAVID R. LAGESON
ALAN J. VER PLOEG
TECHNICAL EDITOR
DAVID A. COPELAND

TELEPHONES
(307) 742 2054
(307) 766 2286

THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF WYOMING
UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
BOX 3008, UNIVERSITY STATION
LARAMIE, WYOMING 82071

Serving Wyoming Since 1933

SURVEY ADVISORY BOARD
D. L. BLACKSTONE, JR. LARAMIE
A. THOMAS GRAHAM, JR. GREEN
EDMUND L. (ROY) HEISEY CASPER
ROBERT S. HOUSTON, LARAMIE
BAYARD D. REA CASPER

RECEIVED
MAR 26 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

TO: Rodney De Bruin, Environmental Geologist

FROM: Gary B. Glass, Deputy Director/Coal Specialist

DATE: March 2, 1979

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON PROPOSED LAND USE DECISIONS FOR THE OVERLAND AND HANNA AREAS OF WYOMING

OVERLAND AREA

In this area, the Bureau of Land Management has designated all or portions of two State coal leases (640 acre tracts) unsuitable or unacceptable for surface mining. In addition, because lands adjacent to four other State coal leases are also designated as unsuitable and unacceptable, the possibility of mining those State leases is seriously impaired as well. See enclosure on which state leases are colored blue.

HANNA AREA

The 2000 feet wide buffer zone around Seminoe Reservoir excludes a sizable tonnage of minable coal. If there is any likelihood that Seminoe Dam will be expanded, and there evidently have been plans to do that, the coal that BLM is now excluding will be lost forever. Any change in land configuration caused by mining at this time might well be hidden by future inundation anyway.

I also seriously question what effect active mining will have on the recreational activities at the reservoir. I don't think mining will deter fishermen. Obviously, steps to prevent fugitive dust and runoff are adequately mitigated before any mining permit is approved anyway.

RECEIVED
MAR 26 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

One final observation, the riparian habitats along the present shoreline, which is a concern of BLM, will be more permanently damaged by enlarging the reservoir than any temporary damages caused by mining. Will BLM also oppose enlargement of this reservoir on similar grounds?

RECEIVED
APR 2 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

WYOMING
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT
CHEYENNE

ED HERSCHLER
GOVERNOR

March 29, 1979

Mr. Fred Wolf
District Manager
Bureau of Land Management
Rawlins District
P.O. Box 670
Rawlins, WY 82301

Re: Hanna and Overland Management Framework Plan

Dear Mr. Wolf:

This is to advise that the State Planning Coordinator's Office, pursuant to the Wyoming Environmental Statement review procedure, has completed the review of the above referenced environmental report. The attached state agency comments are for your information and inclusion into your environmental statement efforts.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the report. Please notify this office of the progress of this project.

Sincerely,

State Planning Coordinator's Office

CO:mee

RECEIVED
MAR 26 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT



☐ state coal leases

DANIEL N. MILLER, JR.
DIRECTOR AND
STATE GEOLOGIST
DEPUTY DIRECTOR AND
STAFF GEOLOGIST
GARY B. GLASS
STAFF GEOLOGISTS
RODNEY H. DE BRUIN
W. DAN HAUSEL
DAVID R. LAGESON
ALAN J. VER PLOEG
TECHNICAL EDITOR
DAVID A. COPELAND

THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF WYOMING
UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
BOX 3008, UNIVERSITY STATION
LARAMIE, WYOMING 82071
Serving Wyoming Since 1911

TELEPHONES
(307) 742-2054
(307) 766-2286

SURVEY ADVISORY BOARD
D. L. BLACKSTONE JR. LARAMIE
A. THOMAS GRAHAM JR. GREEN RIVER
EDMUND L. (ROY) HEISEY CASPER
ROBERT S. HOUSTON LARAMIE
BAYARD D. REA CASPER

TO: Rodney De Bruin, Environmental Geologist

FROM: Gary B. Glass, Deputy Director/Coal Specialist

DATE: March 2, 1979

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON PROPOSED LAND USE DECISIONS FOR THE OVERLAND AND HANNA AREAS OF WYOMING

OVERLAND AREA

In this area, the Bureau of Land Management has designated all or portions of two State coal leases (640 acre tracts) unsuitable or unacceptable for surface mining. In addition, because lands adjacent to four other State coal leases are also designated as unsuitable and unacceptable, the possibility of mining those State leases is seriously impaired as well. See enclosure on which state leases are colored blue.

HANNA AREA

The 2000 feet wide buffer zone around Seminoe Reservoir excludes a sizable tonnage of minable coal. If there is any likelihood that Seminoe Dam will be expanded, and there evidently have been plans to do that, the coal that BLM is now excluding will be lost forever. Any change in land configuration caused by mining at this time might well be hidden by future inundation anyway.

I also seriously question what effect active mining will have on the recreational activities at the reservoir. I don't think mining will deter fishermen. Obviously, steps to prevent fugitive dust and runoff are adequately mitigated before any mining permit is approved anyway.

One final observation, the riparian habitats along the present shoreline, which is a concern of BLM, will be more permanently damaged by enlarging the reservoir than any temporary damages caused by mining. Will BLM also oppose enlargement of this reservoir on similar grounds?

DANIEL N. MILLER, JR.
DIRECTOR AND
STATE GEOLOGIST
DEPUTY DIRECTOR AND
STAFF GEOLOGIST
GARY B. GLASS
STAFF GEOLOGISTS
RODNEY H. DE BRUIN
W. DAN HAUSEL
DAVID R. LAGESON
ALAN J. VER PLOEG
TECHNICAL EDITOR
DAVID A. COPELAND

MAR 7 1979

TELEPHONES
(307) 742 2054
(307) 766 2286

THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF WYOMING
UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
BOX 3008, UNIVERSITY STATION
LARAMIE, WYOMING 82071

Serving Wyoming Since 1933

SURVEY ADVISORY BOARD
D. L. BLACKSTONE, JR. LARAMIE
A. THOMAS GRAHAM, JR. GREEN RIVER
EDMUND L. (ROY) HEISEY CASPER
ROBERT E. HOUSTON LARAMIE
BAYARD D. REA CASPER

March 5, 1979

Mr. Steve Freudenthal
State Planning Coordinator
Wyoming State Clearinghouse
2320 Capitol Avenue
Cheyenne, WY 82002

Dear Mr. Freudenthal:

Mr. Gary B. Glass, Deputy Director/Coal Specialist has reviewed the Hanna and Overland Management Framework Plan Supplements (I.D. No. 79-112P). He has made several comments, which are attached. These are the only comments we have to make at this time.

If your office or another agency would like us to reexamine any part of this report for any specific purpose, please don't hesitate to ask.

Sincerely,

Rodney H. De Bruin

Rodney H. De Bruin
Staff Geologist

RHD:mm
Enclosures: 2

Geology--Interpreting the past to provide for the future



☐ state coal leases

THE STATE OF WYOMING

ED HERSCHLER
GOVERNOR

Wyoming Recreation Commission

604 EAST 25TH STREET CHEYENNE, WYOMING 82002

JAN L. WILSON
Director
777-7696

COMMISSION OFFICERS
REGNALD BAFFORD
PRESIDENT
P.O. Box 626
Lusk 82225
MRS. ROBERT FRISBY
VICE PRESIDENT
2007 Newton Drive
Cody 82414
E. LAWSON SCHWOPE
TREASURER
900 Fleyer Avenue
Cheyenne 82001
MEMBERS
FLOYD BARTLING
P. O. Box 172
Douglas 82633
MARVIN HARSHMAN
1507 West Spruce
Rawlins 82301
WILLIAM MOFFAT
107 W. Jackson Avenue
Riverton 82501
JACK D. OSMOND
P.O. Box 316
Thayne 83127
ALBERT PILCH
1800 Morse Lee
Evanston 82930

March 5, 1979

Mr. Richard Hartman
State Planning Coordinator
2320 Capitol Avenue
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

Dear Mr. Hartman:

The Historical Section of the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Office has received your memorandum of February 28, 1979, and accompanying "Hanna and Overland Management Framework Plan Supplements" (79-112P).

Our staff appreciates the opportunity to comment upon this management plan regarding potential impact upon cultural resources. After reviewing our inventories and other pertinent historical sources, I find no sites either enrolled in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places within those areas designated for leasing subject to environmental statement. However, since these supplements are only general management plans, our staff will await future site specific statements before recommending cultural clearance.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment. I am pleased to the see that the Bureau of Land Management by including "Historic Lands and Sites" within its Unsuitability Criteria acknowledges the importance of identifying and saving Wyoming's cultural resources.

Cordially,

Jan L. Wilson

Jan L. Wilson, Director and
State Historic Preservation Officer

by: Greg Kendrick
Review and Compliance Officer

JLW:GDK:klm

THE STATE OF WYOMING

ED HERSCHLER
GOVERNOR

Wyoming Recreation Commission

OFFICE OF THE WYOMING STATE ARCHEOLOGIST

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
LARAMIE, WYOMING 82071

UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
TELEPHONE: 766-6334

JAN L. WILSON
Acting Director
777-7695

March 8, 1979

COMMISSION OFFICERS
REGNALD BAFFORD
PRESIDENT
P.O. Box 626
Lusk 82225
DUANE REDMAN
VICE PRESIDENT
Dubois 82513
E. LAWSON SCHWOPE
TREASURER
300 Fever Avenue
Cheyenne 82001
MEMBERS
FLOYD BARTLING
P. O. Box 172
Douglas 82633
LYLE SENTZEN
1001 Pioneer Road
Sheridan 82801
MRS. ROBERT FRISBY
2007 Newton Avenue
Cody 82414
MARVIN HARSHMAN
1807 West Spruce
Rawlins 82301
JACK D. OSMOND
P.O. Box 318
Thayne 83127
ALBERT PILCH
1800 Morse Lea
Evanston 82930

There is not enough known about archeological resources in these areas to make this kind of decision.

THE STATE OF WYOMING

ED HERSCH
GOVERNO

State Conservation Commission

2219 CAREY AVENUE PHONE (307) 777-7321 CHEYENNE, WYOMING 82002

WAYNE A. EDGERTON
CONSERVATION COMMISSION STATE EXECUTIVE

TIMOTHY J. KAUTZA
DISTRICT PROGRAM CONSULTANT

DWIGHT KIMSEY
208 WATER QUALITY COORDINATOR

COMMISSION MEMBERS
LARRY BOURRET, CHAIRMAN (STATE AG. DEPT.)
CHARLES JAMESON, VICE-CHAIRMAN (AREA V)
PETER MEIKE, JR. (AREA I DIRECTOR)
JAMES R.L. MAY (AREA II DIRECTOR)
STANLEY PREATOR (AREA III DIRECTOR)
RICHARD DONELSON (AREA IV DIRECTOR)
DR. HAROLD TUMA (U.W. AG. COLLEGE)
GEORGE CHRISTOPLOS (STATE ENGINEER'S OF
EUGENE HARDY (LIVESTOCK BOARD)
JOHN NILAND (D.E.P.A.D.)

March 9, 1979

MEMORANDUM

TO: Don Daiss, Assistant Commissioner of Agriculture

FROM: Timothy J. Kautza, District Program Consultant
State Conservation Commission Tim Kautza

SUBJECT: HANNA AND OVERLAND MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK
PLAN SUPPLEMENTS - BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

I have reviewed the above named subject and offer the following comments for your consideration.

What agencies, organizations, and individuals participated in the development of the supplements? Hopefully, cooperation was sought from others by the Bureau of Land Management when preparing this report. If not, I suggest that this practice be followed in the future.

Who has identified the Muddy Creek, Fillmore Creek and Separation Creek as alluvial valley floors?

Who determines if an area of land is unreclaimable?

Who determines if an area meets the criteria for prime farmland?

I recommend that the Rawlins District of the Bureau of Land Management send a copy of this Management Framework Plan Supplement to the Big Sandy Conservation District, Box 46, Farson 82932; the Little Snake River Conservation District, c/o Lee Airheart, Baggs 82321; the Saratoga-Encampment-Rawlins Conservation District, c/o Dick Barkhurst, Saratoga 82331; the Laramie Rivers Conservation District, c/o Jim May, Rex Route, Box 90, Laramie 82070; and, the Medicine Bow Conservation District, c/o Fred Cronberg, Medicine Bow 82329, and inform each of the open house and public meeting March 14, 1979. I believe these Conservation Districts are interested parties and could offer valuable information to help BLM properly designate lands unsuitable for coal development.

TJK:mn

PROTECT OUR HERITAGE
through the
Conservation of Wyoming's Natural Resources

THE STATE OF WYOMING

ED HERSCHLER
GOVERNOR

Department of Environmental Quality

Water Quality Division

HATHAWAY BUILDING CHEYENNE, WYOMING 82002 TELEPHONE 307 777-7781

MEMORANDUM

To: Robert E. Sundin, Director
Department of Environmental Quality

From: Frank R. Harman
Frank R. Harman, Environmental Engineer
Water Quality Division

Date: March 19, 1979

Subject: Proposed supplement to Wyoming Land Use Decisions for determination of unsuitability for coal development in the Hanna and Overland areas, Rawlins District, State of Wyoming

The above mentioned documents cover revisions to the coal development plans in the Red Rim-China Buttes and Hanna Basin areas in the Rawlins District of the State of Wyoming.

Area descriptions and classifications are dealt with. The unsuitable and acceptable areas are demarcated for the development of coal.

No environmental impact study is included in either of the studies and the general nature of the study does not warrant any comments from the Water Quality Division at this time.

FRH/nc

THE STATE OF WYOMING

ED HERSCH
GOVERNO

Wyoming Department of Agriculture

TELEPHONE: (307) 777-7321 CHEYENNE, WYOMING 82002

LARRY J. BOURRET, COMMISSIONER

BOARD MEMBERS
FRANK LILLEY - LARAMIE
CLARENCE REED - POWELL
JOHN ERLUND - BUFFALO
PETER WRIGHT - CLARK
FRED HAGEMAN - SHOSHONI
ED HERSCHLER - GOVERNOR
DR. HAROLD TUMA - DEAN
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE
UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING, LA

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 23, 1979

TO: State Planning Coordinator
Wyoming State Clearinghouse

FROM: Don Daiss, Assistant Commissioner Don Daiss
and Liaison Officer for E.I.S. Review

SUBJECT: Hanna and Overland Management Framework Plan Supplements
State Identifier Number 79-112P

Attached are the comments of Tim Kautza, District Program Consultant, Wyoming Conservation Commission.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

DDjh

Messenger

THE STATE OF WYOMING

ED HERSCHLER
GOVERNOR

Department of Environmental Quality

LAND QUALITY DIVISION

STATE OFFICE BUILDING — TELEPHONE 307-777-7756 — CHEYENNE, WYOMING 82002

March 29, 1979

3/30/79

Mr. Daniel P. Baker
State Director
Bureau of Land Management
State Office
P.O. Box 1828
Cheyenne, WY 82001

RE: 3500 (933) 1608

Dear Dan:

Your letter of March 8, 1979 to Bob Sundin concerning the preliminary application of the alluvial valley floor unsuitability criteria to two areas in the Rawlins district was forwarded to myself for review and response. The staff has evaluated the supplied text concerning criteria and the maps for the Hanna Basin Area and the Red Rim - China Buttes Area. As a result of this review I provide the following response to your preliminary application of the alluvial valley floor criteria as related to the provisions of P.L. 95-87.

Within the background documents where you describe your evaluation procedures for the application of the criteria to various drainages reveals that your preliminary evaluation of the unsuitability criteria in actuality involves the identification of areas which may be alluvial valley floors. In this respect the standards that you have chosen for identifying alluvial valley floors are not totally correct for making an affirmative type declaration of the presence of an alluvial valley floor.

In accordance with the definition of an alluvial valley floor, as provided in P.L. 95-87, a stream must be boardered by unconsolidated stream laid deposits which will lend themselves to subirrigation and flood irrigation agricultural activities. This implies that there must exist intensive agricultural activities (mechanically harvested crops or improved pasture) or the relief and soils are condusive to intensive agricultural activities.

In accordance with Section 510(b)(5), affirmative declaration of the presence of an alluvial valley floor does not necessarily imply that the alluvial valley floor is prohibited from mining. Under the section of your evaluation entitled "Suitability" you appear to be implying that the simple identification of an alluvial valley floor prohibits an area from being mined. This is an incorrect

assumption. If the alluvial valley floor is "undeveloped rangeland" or if the land has been developed, implying it has been cropped or hayed, but the acreage is so small that it contributes very little to a farm's total production, such lands could be mined. In Southcentral Wyoming many drainage areas which may be declared alluvial valley floors will be undeveloped rangeland throughout most of the reach of the stream. Additionally, an area maybe unsuitable for mining if the mining operation located adjacent to an alluvial valley floor would create a "material damage" to those waters which supply the alluvial valley floors. This second prohibitive provision does not appear to have been considered in your criteria.

I have taken the liberty to attach the Division's Guideline No. 9. I suggest your review those sections concerning Identification, Importance to Farming and Material Damage. I would suggest that you review this enclosed document for I am suspicious of the criteria and conclusions you have reached. If there are questions concerning this response you should direct your questions to Gary Beach of this office.

Sincerely,

W. C. Ackerman

Walter C. Ackerman
Administrator

GB:WCA:dlw

Guideline No. 9
Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality
Land Quality Division

Alluvial Valley Floors

This document is a guideline only. Its contents are not to be interpreted by applicants, operators, or DEQ staff as mandatory. Its preparation is the result of numerous requests from coal applicants and operators, who have expressed a need for guidance to assist them in preparation of a comprehensive initial application containing all required information.

The guideline follows the following format:

Part I - Definitions Concerning Alluvial Valley Floors.

Part II - Identification of an Alluvial Valley Floor.

Part III - Identification of the Extent of an Alluvial Valley Floor.

Part IV - Importance of Alluvial Valley Floors to Farming.

Part V - Evaluation of Material Damage.

Part VI - Evaluation of Essential Hydrologic Functions.

Part VII - Monitoring During Mining and Reclamation.

A reference for more information on alluvial valley floors is the draft of, "Technical Identification and Study of Alluvial Valley Floors, Guideline," by Jack Schmidt, published by the Office of Surface Mining, Denver, Colorado, August 15, 1978.

I. DEFINITIONS FOR PURPOSES OF THIS GUIDELINE

1. "Adjacent area" Those areas of natural and human resources contiguous to or near the affected land which may be impacted by surface coal mining and reclamation operations conducted within a permit area during the life of a mine. (Proposed Rules and Regulations, OSM).

2. "Affected alluvial valley floor" For purposes of Part IV, those portions of an alluvial valley floor where use of the land for farming will be interrupted, discontinued or precluded by mine disturbance and/or where the essential hydrologic functions cannot be preserved during the mining operations.

3. "Affected land" The area of land from which overburden is removed, or upon which overburden, development waste rock or refuse is deposited, or both, access roads, haul roads, mineral stockpiles, mill tailings, impoundment basins, and all other lands whose natural state has been or will be disturbed as a result of the operation. (Wyoming Environmental Quality Act).

R Peterson/January 79/Rev. 1.

(I. Continued)

4. "Agricultural activities" The process of cultivating the soil, producing crops, and raising livestock and in varying degrees the preparation of these products for man's use.

5. "Alluvial saturated zone" A thoroughly wet area or areas within unconsolidated stream laid deposits that may or may not be in communication with aquifers outside of these deposits.

6. "Alluvial valley floors" The unconsolidated stream laid deposits holding streams where water availability is sufficient for subirrigation or flood irrigation agricultural activities but does not include upland areas which are generally overlain by a thin veneer of colluvial deposits composed chiefly of debris from sheet erosion deposits by unconcentrated runoff or slope wash, together with talus, other mass movement accumulation and windblown deposits. (Wyoming Environmental Quality Act).

7. "Animal unit (AU)" The amount of feed required to maintain an average sized cow (1,000 lbs.) for one year. An Animal Unit Month (AUM) is the amount of feed required to maintain an average sized cow for one month.

8. "Aquifer" A zone, stratum or group of strata that can store and transmit water in sufficient quantities for a specific use. (Land Quality Division Rules and Regulations).

9. "Capillary zone" Moist soil in direct communication with the water table by capillary action. This distance may be generally assumed to be 3 feet above the water table when field testing is not practical.

10. "Diversion" A channel, embankment, or other manmade structure constructed for the purpose of diverting water from one area to another. (Land Quality Division Rules and Regulations).

11. "Essential hydrologic functions" The role of the valley floor in collecting, storing, and regulating the natural flow of surface water and groundwater, and in providing a place for irrigated and subirrigated farming, by reason of its position in the landscape and characteristics of its underlying materials. (Land Quality Division Rules and Regulations).

12. "Farming" The practice of agricultural activities.

13. "Flood irrigation" Irrigation through natural overflow or the temporary diversion of high flows in which the entire surface of the soil is covered by a sheet of water. This definition includes:

(I. Continued)

a. Natural irrigation upon a strip of relatively horizontal land bordering a stream which is overtopped by the agriculturally useful flood, that is, a flood with a 2 or 3 year recurrence interval.

b. Artificial irrigation with a reasonable diversion that transports natural streamflow by gravity.

14. "Material damage" Changes in the quality and quantity of surface water and groundwater supplied to alluvial valley floors that would significantly reduce the productivity of flood irrigation and/or subirrigation agricultural activities on the alluvial valley floor.

15. "Subirrigation" The supplying of water to plants from below or the existence of a capillary zone or saturated subsurface where water is available for use by vegetation.

16. "Undeveloped rangeland" Open areas used for grazing having no structures for controlling the grazing disturbance of livestock.

17. "Unconsolidated stream laid deposits" Earthen materials transported and precipitated within a body of water flowing downslope along a definite path.

II. IDENTIFICATION CRITERIA

A. Introduction

The items below require analysis to make a positive identification of an alluvial valley floor. For certain site specific conditions, a negative declaration may be made by proving the absence of some of these items.

1. A stream is underlain by unconsolidated stream laid deposits.

2. Subirrigation or flood irrigation naturally occurs.

3. Flood irrigation may be or presently is practiced on the site.

4. Water quantity and quality is sufficient for flood irrigation or subirrigation agricultural activities.

Procedures in Sections B, C, and D are suggested to aid in identifying the items above. Procedures labeled with a single asterisk (*) do not require special equipment and may be used as a preliminary identification procedure.

B. Identification of Unconsolidated Stream Laid Deposits

Most streams will be underlain by these deposits. Positive identification is obtained by observing:

(II. Continued)

*a. Point bars, splays, abandoned meanders, flood plains, or terraces at the site, or;

*b. Bedload or washload sediments deposited or transported in a nonbedrock channel bottom.

C. Identification of Flood Irrigation and Subirrigation.

1. Subirrigation identification.

Three criteria are recommended for positive identification of subirrigation.

*a. Identification of significant amounts of subirrigated indicator plant species.

b. Identification of an alluvial saturated zone.

c. Identification of abundant roots of agriculturally useful plants extending;

(1) into the capillary zone or the water table, or;

(2) into a soil zone indicating reduced conditions by the presence of grey or blue mottles.

2. Flood irrigation determination.

Flood irrigation identification may be divided into natural and artificial flood irrigation.

a. Natural flood irrigation.

*(1) Identification of significant amounts of flood irrigated indicator plant species.

(2) Analysis of flood flow using recorded data and/or calculated data to determine agriculturally useful floods.

(3) Extrapolation of flood flow data on stream topography to determine the area inundated by the agriculturally useful flood.

b. Artificial flood irrigation.

(1) Introduction

(a) Artificial flood irrigation may be evaluated by identifying existing artifical flood irrigation on

(II. Continued)

streams within and about the permit area. Existing artificial flood irrigation may be helpful in determining the potential for artificial flood irrigation.

(b) Evaluation of artificial flood irrigation in a detailed process. The local conservation district should be consulted about the site potential for artificial flood irrigation prior to any studies or analysis.

(2) Water Availability.

(a) Water availability may be evaluated in Part II.D.

(3) Procedures.

*(a) Identify streamside sites that are topographically flat enough to artificially flood irrigate.

*(b) Examine water right records and water diversion and transport structures on streams within and about the permit area.

*(c) Document existing and historical artificial flood irrigation on streams within and about the permit area.

*(d) Evaluate the feasibility of artificial flood irrigation operations discovered in (a), (b) and (c) above.

D. Identification of Water Quantity and Quality Sufficient for Flood Irrigation or Subirrigation Agricultural Activities

1. Subirrigation and natural flood irrigation.

Water quantity and quality are sufficient for subirrigation or natural flood irrigation agricultural activities if these irrigation activities are identified in II.C.1 and II.C.2.a. above.

2. Artificial flood irrigation.

a. Water quantity.

(1) Determine the volume of water availability for artificial flood irrigation.

(a) The mean annual flow should first be determined. The amount of this flow occurring during the growing season should be quantified.

(b) The volume of water from the two or three year flood should be determined.

(II. Continued)

(2) Identify an appropriate volume of water (such as 2 acre-feet per acre) required for artificial flood irrigation agricultural sites identified in II.C.2.b.

(3) Evaluate the existing or potential efficiency of the artificial flood irrigation system.

(4) Compare (1), (2), and (3) above.

b. Water quality.

(1) Identify the average water quality for flow during the growing season.

(2) Identify soil chemical and physical quality.

(3) Evaluate long term flood irrigation effects on soil quality.

III. EXTENT OF AN ALLUVIAL VALLEY FLOOR

A. Areal Extent

1. Map the unconsolidated stream laid deposits identified in II.B.

2. Map all areas identified as subirrigated and flood irrigated in II.C. Subtract those areas determined to be deficient in water quantity and/or quality identified in II.D.

3. The overlapping areas mapped in 1. and 2. above is the areal extent of the alluvial valley floor.

4. Artificial subirrigation.

Artificial subirrigation is not considered to be part of an alluvial valley floor. However, in areas where it is unclear whether artificial subirrigation is the cause of increased plant productivity in the area, that area will be considered part of the areal extent of the alluvial valley floor.

B. Depth

1. The depth of an alluvial valley floor is considered to be the depth of unconsolidated stream laid deposits under the area identified in III.A.3. above.

2. The depth should be identified on appropriate cross-sections.

DRAFT

IV. IMPORTANCE OF ALLUVIAL VALLEY FLOORS TO FARMING

A. Introduction.

Mining on alluvial valley floors is prohibited unless the affected alluvial valley floor is undeveloped rangeland which is not significant to farming, or, if the land is developed, it is of such small acreage that it would have a negligible impact on a farm's agricultural production (W.S. 35-11-406(h)(xiii)(A)). Section B, below provides criteria by which an alluvial valley floor may be classified as undeveloped rangeland. Appropriate maps and data should be provided to affirmatively demonstrate that areas determined to be undeveloped rangeland will meet the criteria of Section B. If the alluvial valley floor does not qualify as undeveloped rangeland, such lands should be considered developed and the applicant should provide the data requested in Section C so that the regulatory authority can determine the importance of the developed lands to a farm's agricultural production. Prior to conducting the assessment of Section B, the extent of the affected alluvial valley floor must be determined and the relationship of land uses (both historic and present) to the affected alluvial valley floor must be known.

B. Criteria for Classifying Alluvial Valley Floors as Undeveloped Rangeland.

Undeveloped rangeland occurs within an alluvial valley floor where:

1. No haylands or croplands supported by subirrigation or flood irrigation (natural or artificial) have existed, or

2. Where less than 50% of a grazing unit's carrying capacity (animal unit months-AUMs) is provided by the alluvial valley floor.

C. Data Used to Determine the Importance of Developed Land to a Farm's Agricultural Production.

Affected alluvial valley floors which do not qualify as undeveloped rangeland as defined in Section B above, shall be considered developed land and the importance of these lands to a farm's operation determined. Information concerning developed lands should reflect changes in ownership/tenancy and management practices for not less than five years prior to August 3, 1977 and to the present. Where developed lands exist, the following information for the farm(s) which relies upon the developed land for production should be provided in the mine permit application:

1. Information for total farm production to include:

a. An inventory of typical livestock numbers.

DRAFT

(IV. Continued)

b. A cropland/hayland use summary for typical production and marketing years, including the following:

(1) Acreage of each crop grown;

(2) Yield per acre;

(3) Total production harvested;

(4) Estimated carrying capacity of aftermath(AUMs);

(5) Disposition of the crops(percentage);

(a) Amount fed to farm's livestock; and

(b) Amount sold.

c. Acreage and estimated carrying capacity (AUMs) of the range and pasture resources of the farm under typical weather conditions, excluding crop production and carrying capacity of crop aftermath.

2. Information for farm's developed lands within affected alluvial valley floor to include:

a. Information as requested in 1.b. and c. above;

b. A history of land uses and production; and

c. Maps showing:

(1) History of ownership/tenancy of the affected alluvial valley floor and adjacent lands.

(2) History of land uses and management practices within and adjacent to the affected alluvial valley floor, e.g. fencing, irrigation structures, haylands, croplands, pasturelands, etc.

(3) Extent of subirrigation.

(4) Extent of affected alluvial valley floor.

Information requested in this section should be provided with an affidavit from the landowner/tenant. At the request of the landowner/tenant and in accordance with W.S. 35-11-1101(a) information concerning an operation may be retained as confidential information.

(IV. Continued)

D. Importance of Developed Land to a Farm's Agricultural Production.

Where developed lands are involved in a proposed mining operation and where agricultural use of such developed lands would be interrupted, discontinued or precluded during mining, the loss of such lands from a farm's production capabilities must be assessed. If it is determined that the loss to farm production would only cause a negligible impact upon total production then a permit to mine may be granted. The equation of

$$P = 3 + 0.0014X$$

may be used to estimate farm production loss where "P" is the percentage of productive loss considered to be of a negligible impact to a Wyoming farm and "X" is the number of animal units of total farm production in excess of 100. The equation is a result of the following assumptions: (1) That a 3 percent loss in production to a small viable farming operation (100AUs) would constitute a production loss in excess of that which could be absorbed through management changes; and (2) that production loss which can be absorbed by viable farming operations will generally increase as total farm production increases. To utilize the equation, all farm production must be converted to animal units.

V. MATERIAL DAMAGE

A. Introduction

1. Alluvial valley floors studied for possible material damage includes both those that are within a permit area but will not be mined and those that are within "adjacent areas" to affected lands.

Water quality parameters and the duration of monitoring may be referenced in Land Quality Division Guideline 4 and Guideline 8.

2. Identification of Adjacent Areas

a. Identify aquifers affected by mining operations.

b. Estimate the area of probable drawdown of those affected aquifers identified in "2.a." above.

c. Pinpoint the affected aquifers identified in "2.a." above in hydraulic communication with the alluvial saturated zone within the area identified in "2.b." above.

d. Adjacent areas are the areas identified in "2.c." and all alluvial valley floors downstream of the permit area to their confluence with the next major tributary.

(V. Continued)

B. Pre-mining Material Damage Assessment

1. Surface Water

a. Surface water studies should include but not be limited to the following:

(1) Changes in surface flow volume due to evaporation and/or dewatering.

(2) Changes in surface water temperature.

(3) Changes in the baseline surface water quality normally supplied to the valley.

(4) Long term interruption of surface water quality and quantity supplied to the alluvial valley after reclamation.

b. Specific studies

(1) Water balance

(a) Perform a reconnaissance baseline surface water balance.

(b) Compare (1)(a) above to the estimated surface water balance during mining and reclamation.

(c) Evaluate material damage to alluvial valley floors.

(2) Erosion analysis

(a) Determine baseline sediment load.

(b) Compare (2)(a) above to the estimated sediment load during mining and reclamation.

(c) Evaluate downstream material damage to alluvial valley floors.

(3) Water quality

(a) Determine baseline water quality.

(b) Compare (3)(a) above to the estimated water quality during mining and reclamation.

(c) Evaluate downstream material damage to alluvial valley floors.

(V. Continued)

2. Groundwater

a. Groundwater studies should include but not be limited to the following:

(1) Changes in the volume of groundwater inflow to the alluvial valley floor.

(2) Changes in groundwater quality to the stream and the alluvial saturated zone.

(3) Long term interruption of groundwater quality and quantity inflow to the alluvial valley after reclamation.

b. Specific Studies.

(1) Water balance

(a) Perform a reconnaissance baseline groundwater balance.

(b) Compare (1)(a) above to the groundwater balance during mining and reclamation.

(c) Evaluate material damage to alluvial valley floors.

(2) Aquifer hydraulic properties and water quality

(a) Determine baseline water quality in the alluvial saturated zone.

(b) Evaluate potential damage to aquifers within the adjacent area due to mining operations.

(c) Using measured and predicted aquifer properties, generally model long-term and short-term changes in groundwater quality during mining and reclamation.

(3) Water quality

(a) Determine baseline water quality.

(b) Compare (3)(a) above to the estimated water quality during mining and reclamation.

(c) Evaluate downstream material damage to alluvial valley floors.

(VI. Continued)

c. "Case Y" alluvial valley floor.
(1) Description

(a) Upland channel transports water, and flood flow recharges the alluvial saturated zone. The alluvial saturated zone storage capacity contributes, at most, only a few days of additional water to the channel.

(2) Identification procedure
(a) Backhoe pit in alluvial material next to the channel identifies an alluvial saturated zone.
(b) Vegetation species identify only small, scattered, noncontinuous areas of subirrigation.

d. "Case Z" alluvial valley floor.
(1) Description
(a) Upland channel acts only to transport water.
(2) Identification procedure
(a) Backhoe pit in alluvial material next to the channel shows no subirrigation of agriculturally useful plants from the alluvial saturated zone.

2. Specific studies suggested for alluvial valley floor cases identified in Section B.1.

NOTE: All studies referenced in this section refer to studies in Part VI.C. All studies in Part VI.C. labeled with an asterisk (*) should be performed for all cases of alluvial valley floors.

a. "Case W" alluvial valley floor.

Study all asterisk (*) areas, plus;
(1) Section 1. (a.(1), b.(1), d.(2), h.(1))
(2) Section 2. (a.(1), a.(2), b.(1))
(3) Section 3. (all)
(4) Section 4. (all)
(5) Section 5. (all)

b. "Case X" alluvial valley floor.

Study all asterisk (*) areas, plus;
(1) Section 1. (a.(1), b.(1), d.(2), e.(1) h.(1))
(2) Section 2. (a.(1), a.(2), b.(1)
(3) Section 3. (a.(1), b.(1), b.(3), d.(2), d.(3))
(4) Section 4. (all)
(5) Section 5. (all)

c. "Case Y" alluvial valley floor.

Study all asterisk (*) areas, plus;
(1) Section 1. (a.(1), b.(1), e.(1))
(2) Section 2. (a.(1), a.(2), b.(2))
(3) Section 3. (a.(1), d.(2), d.(4))
(4) Section 4. (all)
(5) Section 5. (all)

(VI. Continued)

d. "Case Z" alluvial valley floor

Study all asterisk (*) areas, plus;
(1) Section 1. (e.(1))
(2) Section 2. (a.(3), b.(2))
(3) Section 3. (* areas)
(4) Section 4. (* areas)
(5) Section 5. (all)

C. Specific Study Suggestions

1. Erosion balance

a. Identify the fluvial history and the present fluvial state of the stream.
(1) Map aggradational and degradational reaches of the stream within, upstream, and downstream of the permit area.

b. Describe the longitudinal profile of the stream indicating depth to bedrock.
(1) Discuss the map.

c. Describe the existing channel, floodplain, and terrace profiles.
*(1) Survey representative cross-sections, taken at approximately every 1500 feet of stream.

d. Identify the channel and floodplain texture, sediment load, size distribution, and bedforms if present.
*(1) Collect channel sediment samples, and separate bedload and washload fractions.
(2) Analyze the texture of the surface of the floodplain.

e. Identify vegetative stabilizers in the active channel.
(1) Estimate the quantity within the channel.

f. Identify channel slope
*(1) Map on an appropriate scale (1"=400').

g. Determine existing meander properties.
*(1) Map on an appropriate scale (1"=400').
*(2) Calculate sinuosity and other appropriate parameters.

h. Calculate stream velocity.
(1) Develop rating curves and estimate velocities using cross-sections identified in 1.c.(1) above at the estimated 2. 3, 5, 50 and 100 year flood.

VI. ESSENTIAL HYDROLOGIC FUNCTIONS

A. Introduction

1. Essential hydrologic functions of flood irrigation and subirrigation agricultural activities refer to the alluvial valley floor identified in "Part III, Extent of the Alluvial Valley Floor". One way to preserve the "essential hydrologic functions" is to not mine the area. If the alluvial valley floor is to be mined, studies are required to collect the data necessary to identify the functions.

2. Part VI.B. recognizes four cases of alluvial valley floors. Part VI.B. references specific studies in Part VI.C. that may be performed for each case to help identify essential hydrologic functions.

3. Part VI.C. contains a potpourri of specific studies to aid in identifying essential hydrologic functions. Specific studies are found under these general categories;

a. Erosion balance,
b. Surface water balance,
c. Alluvial saturated zone balance,
d. Soil survey and analysis,
e. Vegetation.

A suggested method of using this section would be to identify the case of alluvial valley floor using Section B, then proceed to perform the studies referenced in Section C.

B. Alluvial Valley Floor Identification and Studies

1. Description and Identification Procedures of Alluvial Valley Floor Categories.
a. "Case W" alluvial valley floor:
(1) Description and identification procedure.
(a) Streamflow is perennial.
b. "Case X" alluvial valley floor.
(1) Description
(a) Streams for which the alluvial saturated zone storage capacity is great enough to contribute to stream flow. The stream is dry at some periods of the year.
(2) Identification procedure.
(a) Backhoe pit in alluvial material next to channel identifies an alluvial saturated zone.
(b) Subirrigated vegetation appears nearly continuously down the channel length.
(c) Hydrograph analysis or the comparison of alluvial water levels and stream stage identifies baseflow and interflow components.

(VI. Continued)

2. Surface water balance

a. Collect streamflow records, taken upstream and downstream of the affected alluvial valley floor.
This may encompass;
(1) Continuous recording gages and records for one year.
(2) Hydrograph and hyetograph comparison for a storm event.
(3) Crest gages read monthly for one year.
*(4) Discharge-volume-gage analysis.
*(5) Monthly samples of water quality (reference L.Q.D. Guideline #4 and Supportive Handout).

b. Collect streamflow records on tributaries affected or diverted by mining operations in the affected land.
This may encompass;
(1) Continuous recording gage records for one year.
(2) Crest gages read monthly for one year.
*(3) Discharge-volume-gage analysis.
*(4) Monthly samples of water quality (reference L.Q.D. Guideline #4 and Supportive Handout).

3. Alluvial saturated zone water balance

a. Identify configuration, location, and strata of the alluvial saturated zone; develop geologic cross-sections.
(1) Use backhoe pits and/or strategically located drill holes and record geologic logs to bedrock.
b. Describe the connection of the alluvial saturated zone with adjacent confined or unconfined aquifers.
(1) Define the piezometric surface(s).
(2) Perform pump tests to determine the range and distribution of aquifer properties.
(3) Identify faults or other hydraulic boundaries.
c. Identify specific lenses or perched water in the alluvial saturated zone.
*(1) Use backhoe pits and/or strategically located drill holes and record geologist logs at appropriate intervals.
d. Monitor subsurface groundwater in the alluvial saturated zone within, upstream and downstream of the permit area to adequatley define the dynamic interrelationships of the system.
This may encompass;
(1) Continuous recording gages on piezometers and wells completed in the alluvial saturated zone on both sides of the stream for one year.
(2) Monthly readings on piezometers and wells completed in the alluvial saturated zone on both sides of the stream for one year.
(3) Monthly quality samples in the alluvial saturated zone (reference L.Q.D. Guideline #4).
(4) Quarterly quality samples in the alluvial saturated zone (reference L.Q.D. Guideline #4).

(VI. Continued)

4. Soil survey and analysis

a. Perform a pre-mining soil assessment.
*(1) Conduct a soil survey (reference L.Q.D. Guideline #1).
b. Determine soil suitability for flood irrigation and sub-irrigation.
*(1) Evaluate soil suitability. (reference L.Q.D. Guideline #3).
c. Determine soil moisture characteristics and lithology.
(1) Evaluate and describe stream laid textural layers if present and describe both the potential and the actual moisture holding characteristics of each layer.

5. Vegetation
*a. Perform a pre-mining vegetation inventory (reference L.Q.D. Guideline #2).

VII. MONITORING DURING MINING AND RECLAMATION

A. Groundwater

1. Monitor water quality and quantity in affected aquifers in communication with the alluvial saturated zone, after determining baseline.

2. Monitor water quality and quantity in the alluvial aquifer(s) if needed, after determining baseline.

B. Surface water

1. Monitor surface water quantity and quality after determining baseline for quantity and quality.

C. Vegetation

1. Monitor subirrigated vegetation communities to identify potential changes.

United States Department of the Interior
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
ROCKY MOUNTAIN REGIONAL OFFICE
655 Parfet Street
P.O. Box 25287
Denver, Colorado 80225

RECEIVED
MAR 23 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

REPLY REFER TO:
L1419 (RMR)PC

MAR 21 1979

Memorandum

To: District Manager, Rawlins District, Bureau of Land Management, Rawlins, Wyoming

From: Associate Regional Director, Planning and Resource Preservation, Rocky Mountain Region

Subject: Hanna and Overland Management Framework Plan Supplements

We have reviewed the subject supplements relating to the Hanna Basin and Red Rim-China Butte areas. No units of the National Park System appear to be affected; thus, we offer no comment.

Richard A. Strait

CONSERVE AMERICA'S ENERGY

Save Energy and You Serve America!

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
2120 Capitol Ave., Room 7009
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001

RECEIVED
FEB 05 1979
RAWLINS DISTRICT

IN REPLY REFER TO:

February 2, 1979

Memorandum

To: District Manager, Bureau of Land Management, P.O. Box 670, Rawlins, Wyoming 82301

From: Coal Coordinator, Wyoming

Subject: Hanna and Overland Planning Effort

Thank you for your letter of January 23, 1979 concerning the Hanna and Overland planning effort. On behalf of the Fish and Wildlife Service, we appreciate your invitation for involvement. We will help in any way we are able.

RECEIVED
FEB 05 1979

(307)
635-3416

February 2, 1979

WYOMING OUTDOOR COUNCIL
P.O. Box 1184 2003 Central Cheyenne, WY 82001

Fred Wolf
District Manager
Rawlins District Office, BLM
P.O. Box 670
Rawlins, Wyoming 82301

Dear Mr. Wolf,

Thank you very much for your communication regarding the revision of the Hanna and Overland Management Framework Plans. The Outdoor Council is indeed very interested in participating in the process. We are particularlyinterested in the proper application of the unsuitability standards, coal demand estimations and quality citizen input.

In the preparation of the federal EIS on coal leasing, it was policy to release the Department of Interior's and BLM's working papers to the public as soon as possible. I would like to know and encourage that the same policy be followed in the revision of the Hanna and Overland MFPs.

I would also appreciate it if you would send copies of the existing plans so that I may familiarize myself personally with their content.

Sometime in February, I would like to meet with you to discuss the progress of the revision. Since the state legislature is in session, I can not at this time positively commit myself to a meeting, but I do want you to know that if it is at all possible I would like to meet before the public meeting.

On another topice of mutual concern, I would like to be kept abreast of the wilderness review process in the Rawlins district. Bruce Hamilton, Northern Great Plains Representative for the Sierra Club, informed me that a staff person from your office was interested in meeting with us to discuss the review and pour over maps. Unfortunately, this was delayed because I had to leave Lander to return to Cheyenne to assist in the lobby effort. I am still very much interested in the meeting. If you could pass this along to the appropriate person, it would be of great assistance toward developing communication for this review process as well.

Thank you for your letter.

Sincerely,

Debra East
Field Representative
Wyoming Outdoor Council

-- Recycled Paper --

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
Memorandum

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

IN REPLY REFER TO:
3500

To : Floyd Ewing, Area Manager, MBRA Date: MAR 1 5 1979

FROM : Wally Stiles, Geologist, Div. of Resources

SUBJECT: Coal Unsuitability meeting with Coal Companies at Hanna, Wyoming

A meeting was held on February 28, 1979. with coal companies concerning the application of the coal unsuitability criteria to Hanna Basin and Red Rim/China Butte KRCRAS.

Personnel in attendance were as follows:

Ed Ziolkowski and A. M. Hannum - Energy Development Corp.
T. R. Irvin and Joel Strid - Carbon County Coal Company
Jim Johnson - Arch Mineral Corporation
Fred Wolf, Ron Wenker, Floyd Ewing and Wally Stiles, Rawlins District Office, Bureau of Land Management
Andrew Tarshis - WSO, Bureau of Land Management

The application of the coal unsuitability criteria was explained and a presentation of the coal unsuitability maps was conducted. After the presentation, a question and answer period was held in which the coal companies expressed their concerns about the various acreages that are acceptable and unsuitable by either multiple use analysis and unsuitability criteria, and the location and amount of the unsuitable acres.

The coal companies' main concern was with the areas deemed unsuitable in the Red Rim/China Butte area. Concern was also expressed over the criteria and the fact that they did not take into consideration the checkerboard land pattern and the other landowners. Feeling was that the unsuitability criteria did not work very well on the checkerboard and did not consider underground mining.

DSC-1941-2
Mar. 1974

RECEIVED
MAR 28 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE
P. O. Box 2440, Casper, Wyoming 82602

March 27, 1979

Fred Wolf, District Manager
Bureau of Land Management
Rawlins District
P. O. Box 670
Rawlins, Wyoming 82301

Dear Mr. Wolf:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Hanna and Overland Management Framework Plan Supplements.

My staff has reviewed these supplements and we have no comment for improvement at this time.

Sincerely,

Frank S. Dickson
State Conservationist

Advisory Council On Historic Preservation

RECEIVED
FEB 26 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

1522 K Street N.W.
Washington D.C.
20005

February 21, 1979

Mr. Fred Wolf
District Manager
Rawlins District Office
Bureau of Land Management
P. O. Box 670
Rawlins, Wyoming 82301

Dear Mr. Wolf:

This is in response to your letter of January 23, 1979, concerning the revision of the Hanna and Overland Management Framework Plans (MFPs) for coal development in the Rawlins District of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in Wyoming.

As part of this planning process the BLM should arrange to have the areas impacted by coal development surveyed to identify cultural properties included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places in accordance with the "Procedures for the Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties" (36 CFR Part 800). After the survey is complete the BLM should consult the Wyoming Historic Preservation Officer to determine whether any property included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register will be affected by the proposed undertaking. If such a property will be affected and the project cannot be redesigned to avoid that effect, then the BLM is required to afford the Council an opportunity to comment on the undertaking pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. Sec. 470f, as amended, 90 Stat. 1320).

Should any effects upon cultural properties included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register be identified in the development of the MFPs we look forward to working with the BLM in accordance with the regulations promulgated by the Council that become effective March 1, 1979. (January 30, 1979, Federal Register).



Should you have any questions or require any assistance in this matter, please contact Brit Allan Storey of my staff at (303) 234-4946, an FTS number or at P. O. Box 25085, Denver, Colorado 80225.

Sincerely,

Louis S. Wall
Chief, Western Office
of Review and Compliance

ROCKY MOUNTAIN ENERGY COMPANY

ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVITIES
CLARK M. BOLSER
MANAGER

March 23, 1979

RECEIVED
MAR 26 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

Mr. Fred Wolf
District Manager
Bureau of Land Management
P.O. Box 670
1300 Third Street
Rawlins, Wyoming 82301

Gentlemen:

Re: Proposed Supplemental
MFP--Overland Planning Unit

Please find enclosed Rocky Mountain Energy's formal written comments concerning the BLM's proposed supplemental MFP for the Overland Planning Unit.

As you are aware from our recent discussions and our statement at the March 14, 1979 hearing in Rawlins, we are extremely concerned about the potential effect the BLM's management framework planning efforts under the federal coal management program could have on our ability to develop private coal in the Red Rim/China Butte area. Further, we are convinced by this first "test of the process" that unless revisions are made to the federal coal management program and the BLM multiple use planning objectives, little if any additional federal or private coal will be developed in southern Wyoming. I believe we are in agreement that the "checkerboard" land ownership pattern in southern Wyoming makes it difficult for either the BLM, Rocky Mountain Energy Company or private surface owners to effectively manage its own lands and resources without direct impact on the others.

In our comments we have attempted to detail how we believe that the BLM erred in applying the unsuitability criteria and its multiple use considerations. We trust that these comments will assist the BLM in reevaluating its proposed MFP. These comments should also serve to illustrate the problems inherent in trying to implement the proposed federal coal management program in the southern Wyoming checkerboard area.

Sincerely yours,

Clark M. Bolser

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Dan Baker (w/ enclosure)

GREEN RIVER
(307) 875-2611 Ext. 270

ROCK SPRINGS
(307) 362-7870 Ext. 270

SWEETWATER COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
P. O. BOX 791
GREEN RIVER, WYOMING 82935

RECEIVED
MAR 27 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

March 21, 1979

Bureau of Land Management
Rawlins District Office
P. O. Box 670
Rawlins, Wyoming 82301

Gentlemen:

The Sweetwater County Planning and Zoning Commission has serious reservations on the strict application of the "Unsuitability Criteria" as applied in the proposed revisions to the Overland Management Framework Plan defining potential coal development.

For example, Criteria #7, "Historic Lands and Sites", should be limited to visible portions of a historic trail system and a one-half mile buffer along the entire length of the Oregon Trail system would unnecessarily encumber multiple land uses.

Further, time allotted to Sweetwater County for review of this area and the proposed revisions to the Overland Management Framework Plan is totally inadequate for any sophisticated response. This is particularly true during the severe winter weather. Therefore, the Sweetwater County Planning and Zoning Commission reserves additional time to forward comments.

Very truly yours,

Robert Volcic

Robert Volcic, Chairman
Sweetwater County Planning &
Zoning Commission

RV/va

cc: Board of County Commissioners

RECEIVED
MAR 26 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

FINAL COMMENTS OF
ROCKY MOUNTAIN ENERGY COMPANY
ON THE
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT'S
OVERLAND MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK
PLAN SUPPLEMENT

March 23, 1979

Rocky Mountain Energy Company
4704 Harlan Street
Denver, Colorado 80212
(303) 433-6841

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
GENERAL OVERVIEW	3
GENERAL CRITERIA OBJECTIONS	5
SPECIFIC CRITERIA OBJECTIONS	8
MULTIPLE USE	20
ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS	21
CONCLUSIONS	23

and production of coal in that region is a desirable goal. The Draft EIS states that it is the "judgment of the President and Congress that the federal government should encourage and foster the use of coal" (p. 2-50). It is especially important to keep this in mind when it becomes apparent that the enormous value of the coal resource to the nation has been almost completely discounted in the planning process.

A second important fact to remember is that the particular area under study is characterized by the unique checkerboard ownership pattern of the land grant. Presumably, the Coal Management Program was created with the model of private and federal holdings being significantly larger than the one square mile sections found in the Overland area. This would be a logical assumption as land grant areas comprise a relatively small portion of the total geographic area where the majority of federal lands are located. As a result of the checkerboard ownership pattern, the areas involved in the Overland MFP are affected by application of the unsuitability criteria in a manner that is quite different from that which would be the case if the tracts of privately owned land in the areas were larger. The process operates in the checkerboard area to negatively affect private coal development opportunities in a manner that cannot have been intended by Congress under SMCRA or by the President in his Environmental Message of 1977. As will be discussed later, RMEC is of the opinion that a strong case can be made that the coal reserves in the checkerboard areas should be evaluated by a process more closely related to their unique characteristics.

Introduction

The Bureau of Land Management has asked for comments on the Overland Management Framework Plan Supplement issued in February 1979. Rocky Mountain Energy Company ("RMEC"), as the holder of substantial mineral rights in the Overland area, is vitally concerned with the land use proposals made by the BLM and appreciates the opportunity of commenting on the MFP Supplement.

In preparing the revised MFP the BLM was guided by the Draft Environmental Statement of the Federal Coal Management Program. RMEC has previously submitted detailed comments on this statement, and many of the issues raised in those comments have immediate bearing on the Overland MFP. Unfortunately, the MFP revisions have confirmed our conclusions about the inadequacies of the proposed system for determining what federal lands are suitable for coal development. If the current BLM decisions are allowed to reach fruition, large areas of federal land containing significant reserves of high quality coal will be classified as "unsuitable" for coal development. It is RMEC's position that this result is not desirable from a federal policy standpoint, that it is not mandated by any of the federal or state statutes regulating the mining of coal, and that it is not necessary as a means of preserving existing environmental standards or protecting competing land use values.

Any discussion of land use planning in the southern Wyoming area should begin with the understanding that the continued development

General Overview

The MFP for the Red Rim-China Butte area designates the northern half and southern tip of this area as "unsuitable" for coal development. These designations are made as the result of applying 24 unsuitability criteria (as well as applicable exceptions) and by making multiple use decisions based upon competing land uses. This process was accomplished without consideration of industry input as to mine plans, reclamation and mitigation strategies, and economic analysis of the proposed mines. The task that officials at the local BLM offices were asked to perform was simply unachievable. To properly apply the criteria and all the exceptions would require a data base far more elaborate than anything currently available to the BLM. Furthermore, to acquire such data would take the BLM considerably longer than the time allotted to do so. In fact, a task force has recently been formed to study the question of what exact data is necessary. Also, there has been a flurry of memos from the Department of the Interior, revising, defining and explaining the criteria to the local offices. All this activity indicates that the entire program is currently in a state of development. As such, final determinations based upon that program are premature.

By RMEC estimate, the entire Red Rim-China Butte area has approximately 230 million tons of surface minable coal reserves. The areas remaining as "acceptable" contain 110 million tons; however, much of this is rendered unrecoverable for, without the federal sections, it occurs in units that are too small to mine economically.

There are a number of serious defects in the manner in which the unsuitability criteria have been applied in the Overland MFP. Almost without exception the data necessary for applying the criteria is not available. Despite this fact, the local BLM categorized numerous tracts as "unsuitable", even though their clear directive was to make certain that their determinations were legally defensible. As we shall see, in many cases the BLM's decisions could not be proven even by a preponderance of the evidence, the least stringent test recognized by the law.

The other test used to evaluate the federal lands in the area, namely multiple use, is also subject to strong criticism. The major objection here is that multiple use, when focused on localized areas, presents an unrealistic picture that devalues coal in any area where coal is located.

The remainder of these comments deal with the concerns raised above in a more detailed fashion and present RMEC's suggestions as to what changes might be beneficial. Time constraints as well as lack of sufficient data limit our ability to provide a more thorough discussion in certain respects. In fact, lack of pertinent data is a ubiquitous problem that underscores the entire discussion and buttresses RMEC's claim that almost all determinations of unsuitability should await further study. RMEC also wishes to restate that the criticisms it makes are not a reflection on the BLM personnel so much as the inevitable result of systemic defects.

General Criteria Objections

Under the procedure utilized by the BLM to update the Overland planning unit, it was impossible for them to consider site-specific information regarding the proposed mines because industry input was not sought until after the BLM review. When the areas designated "unsuitable" are viewed with the knowledge of the proposed mine plan at Red Rim, it becomes evident that the BLM is grossly overestimating the impact of coal mining upon the locality.

The mine plan for Red Rim encompasses an area of approximately 8,000 acres. Over the anticipated 31-year mine life, only some 258 acres will be disturbed in any one year. Approximately one third of this acreage will be within the mine boundaries but will not otherwise be directly affected by mining activity. Assuming a two-year lead time for reclamation to begin to take effect, the net result is that at any time only 750 acres are in various stages of mine involvement. Of this 750 acres, half is private land over which the BLM has no control. When this small amount of land to be temporarily disturbed is contrasted, for example, with the 829,600 acres in south-central Wyoming that the BLM estimates is crucial winter range for pronghorn antelope, it becomes apparent that sacrificing all the coal in Red Rim is difficult to justify. Obviously, such a result is not intended by the Federal Coal Management Program.

Another difficulty that arises as a result of the lack of industry input is that the BLM has portrayed the remaining coal reserves in a manner

that simply does not comport with reality. The Overland Revision states that "the acceptable areas contain over 110 million tons of economically recoverable coal". This statement reflects a simplistic view of coal development and is outside the expertise of the BLM. It is obvious that time restrictions did not allow the BLM to make such an analysis.

The marketing of coal is a complex and sophisticated endeavor. Numerous variables go into determining the marketability of coal reserves. The cost to produce the coal, shipping costs, BTU content, sulphur content, demand, cost and availability of alternate fuels, etc., are some of the factors that must be considered. The mere fact that lands labeled "acceptable" overlie 110 million tons of coal does not automatically make that coal "economically recoverable". BLM is simply not in a position to make such an appraisal.

Dealing specifically with Red Rim, the mining plan calls for mining in the northern area and moving southward. However, given the large areas deemed "unsuitable", this plan is no longer useful. Large sections in the north are completely carved out, and the remaining private sections do not comprise logical mining units. Even though there are a few areas containing some "acceptable" federal sections, the magnitude of the project is reduced to such an extent that it is no longer viable.

These problems and others like them point out what should be an obvious fact--that industry is a logical participant in the coal planning process. By inviting industry comment only after the determinations are

made, industry and the BLM can easily become adversaries while industry "attacks" the plan that the Bureau "defends". We suggest that a better approach in the future would be to obtain industry input before and not after data base evaluations and land use decisions are made.

The Department of the Interior instructed the local BLM office that determination of any area to be "unsuitable" was the first step toward a legal designation as such. The reverse was not true since there was no certainty that any commitment of resources would occur; a classification of "acceptable" was not the first step toward a similar legal designation. Furthermore, before an "acceptable" area could actually be leased and mined, all laws, regulations, permit requirements, etc., would have to be complied with, providing a further screen. In this context, the State BLM Director instructed that only those areas "particularly sensitive or obviously excludable" were to be classified "unsuitable". Despite these cautions, the "unsuitable" category was used with little restraint.

Where there was any doubt about the applicability of a criteria, it was to be resolved, or else placed in the "acceptable pending further study" category. As comment under each criteria shows, substantial doubt was present in almost every unsuitability determination.

Another shortcoming of the BLM review was its very narrow reading of the criteria language. This created extremely literal interpretation especially in the case of criteria 13 and 15. The ostensible purpose was

to avoid bias; however, such literal interpretation was not implemented in the case of a number of the exceptions. The exceptions to the criteria were applied in the most haphazard way. For example, BLM stated that mitigation could not be achieved, or that it would be uneconomic. There was no basis for such assumptions and absolutely no data to support them. Without reference to the mine plans, they could not hope to know what mitigation would be required.

There were numerous procedural errors in the implementation of the criteria. These involved inter-agency coordination and ranged from complete failure to conduct a specified task to superficial interaction.

The most widespread error was the failure to collect sufficient data, and the subsequent failure to place lands for which data was lacking in the "acceptable pending further study" category. This is a mistake of immense proportion, for it is impossible to preserve the status quo of an area when one misinterprets the nature of that area.

Specific Criteria Objections

Criterion #7 Historic Lands and Sites

The BLM arbitrarily constructed a one-half mile buffer along the Overland Trail and Washakie Stage Station. This was done without any information as to how the proposed mine would affect this area, and what buffer might be appropriate. By way of comparison, an occupied dwelling, school or church is given a 300 foot buffer, as compared to the

2,640 feet that is required here. That the Overland Trail needs a buffer eight times as large as an occupied home has certainly not been justified.

Criterion #11 Bald and Golden Eagle Nests

One area is eliminated on Red Rim because of a golden eagle nest. Further study shows this nest to be on private land. It should then be the responsibility of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. An exception allows the nest to be moved if the Fish and Wildlife Service approves, but that agency was not contacted regarding the feasibility of this activity.

It is specifically stated that mining within the buffer zone is allowed during the nonbreeding season. Unfortunately, the BLM exception analysis precludes mining within the buffer zone at any time, clearly a contradiction to this criterion.

Criterion #13 Falcon Cliff Nesting Sites

The presence of a sparrow hawk nest was the reason for classifying certain land as "unsuitable". This falcon is by no means unique or endangered in the area of concern. Also, the sparrow hawk adapts well to human activity. Through a taxonomic technicality, protection of the adaptive and plentiful sparrow hawk, not shown to be in need of protection, has further limited coal development. In fact, by establishment of a quarter mile buffer, the common sparrow hawk is given the same level of protection afforded the bald eagle. Such a result hardly seems rooted in logic. BLM wildlife biologists are, no doubt, aware that there is no question

about the stability of the sparrow hawk at the species level. Yet there is no evidence in BLM's analysis that this exceptional situation was given any special consideration. This illustrates the difficulty confronting BLM as a result of the lack of criteria clarity.

A further evaluation of BLM's analysis also shows that the two prairie falcon nesting sites observed in the Red Rim area are on private surface. Criterion 13 specifically indicates that "Federal land containing falcon cliff nesting sites with active nests and a buffer zone of Federal lands 1/4 mile radius from the nest...shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining..." Recognizing that protection of these nesting sites falls within the jurisdiction of the U.S.F.W.S., it seems obvious that some type of interagency coordination would have been appropriate before designating any areas "unsuitable". There is no evidence in BLM's analysis that there was interagency consultation concerning this matter.

Criterion #14 High Interest Migratory Birds

This criterion is designed to protect high priority habitat, on federal lands, of migratory birds of national interest as determined jointly by the BLM and the Fish and Wildlife Services. Given this fact, and knowing that their determinations were to be supportable, the BLM identified eight sites in the Red Rim area alone as "unsuitable" under this criterion. Six of the eight sites were on private land, clearly not within the criterion. There is absolutely no evidence which shows that the habitat is high priority. In fact, BLM's own worksheets indicate that most of

the region is suitable habitat. There is obviously substantial doubt as to the high priority of these sites. Finally, BLM and U.S.F.W.S. did not develop any list of high interest birds. For this reason alone, no areas should have been eliminated through the use of this criterion.

Before the criterion can be implemented as intended, a list of high interest birds must be developed. Furthermore, an effort must be made to determine whether the area is high priority habitat; inclusion of every nest is not in accord with identifying only high priority areas. Finally, the process should be limited to federal land only, and then in conjunction with industry, to determine what effect, if any, mining would have and how that effect can be minimized.

Criterion #15 State Resident Fish and Wildlife

Antelope Critical Winter Range

The application of Criterion 15 eliminated the largest amount of federal land. Unfortunately, this was also the criterion where the greatest number of errors of application were made. The areas designated as "suitable" were classified as most critical winter range for antelope and/or sage grouse strutting grounds.

The data base utilized to make winter range determinations was woefully inadequate. The winter population was determined after a small number of flights over a two-month period. Secondly, even an experienced observer will attest to the high potential for counting errors when censusing this easily harassed wildlife species (antelope are harassed by low-flying planes and may run for a considerable distance, thereby

creating the possibility of counting the same herd several times). Furthermore, the statistical reliability of this short-term survey is open to question.

The BLM, based upon their counts for the Red Rim-China Butte areas, attempted to determine, on a percentage basis, what fractions of a total herd these animals represented. The total herd population estimate, however, was based on Wyoming Game and Fish Department's censuses conducted once every three to five years over the entire herd range, harvest data and ground observation. Since two entirely different methods were used, an attempt to relate one to another is apt to be grossly inaccurate. In fact, the BLM analysis does not support their assumption that the animals seen during the 1978-79 winter were part of the specific herd unit for which serious effects are speculated.

The problems with enumeration and definition of herd associations are not the only difficulties in the BLM analysis. Another occurs in defining the area as most critical winter range. This classification came about largely because the animal population was seen there during the admitted severe winter of 1978-79. Residents of the area tell us that the historic precipitation pattern of the area is that Red Rim is under a deep snow cover, and because of this, antelope are not present during the winter in great numbers. Whereas this type of information lacks scientific verification, it points at the problem of the approach taken by the BLM.

The BLM, as stated, determined the Red Rim area to be most critical winter range. The Wyoming Game and Fish Department identified a different area; east of Red Rim, as most critical. No discussion was held between the two agencies to resolve this conflict. Furthermore, no habitat evaluations were performed to determine if adjacent sites would be capable of supporting displaced animals, despite the fact that under BLM's own evaluation, the vast majority of the herd is wintering elsewhere.

A basic conceptual fault associated with application of the criterion's exclusion mechanism is the supposition that the temporary removal of the speculated critical winter range will result in significant adverse impacts to pronghorn. When considered in terms of the estimated North American pronghorn population (400,000 animals), the number of animals that could be affected on a worst-case basis (1,000 animals) represents only a tiny fraction of this amount. It should be noted that this assumes that all of the 1,000 animals die; there are no attempts to mitigate development impacts; the entire critical winter range area is mined; and that the area of concern actually is critical winter range. This also assumes that, through the required coordination with state government, management objectives could not be temporarily adjusted to accommodate mining. We believe that with proper mitigation, impacts can be reduced to an insignificant level even on local scales.

When considered on a regional basis, potential impacts are still insignificant. The maximum of 1,000 animals to be affected represents only about 2.5 percent of the estimated pronghorn population for south-central Wyoming. The acreage of critical winter range to be affected is equally insignificant. In the Red Rim area, for example, the tract of critical winter range (approximately 19,000 acres) represents approximately 2 percent of the 829,600 acres of crucial winter range estimated to exist in south-central Wyoming. The actual acreage to be affected by mining (less than 8,000 acres) represents less than 1 percent of this figure.

The BLM also assumed that mitigation could not be performed economically. This, of course, they are without sufficient information to determine. Techniques such as planting browse species, stimulating available browse growth, supplementary feeding, snow fencing and removal of obstacles to antelope movements, could be successfully implemented to mitigate the effects mining might have on the antelope, or its required habitat. To ignore these mitigation possibilities was an error on the part of the BLM.

To put these questions in a realistic perspective, BLM must recognize that this wildlife resource is not managed solely for aesthetic purposes or purely as part of a general environmental maintenance program. Populations are evaluated and managed largely to meet recreational demands. Just as management controls are responsive to the effects of climatic

conditions (such as major herd size decreases resulting from this year's severe winter), management objectives can be adjusted to accommodate the far more limited effects of mining. Before these coal resources are arbitrarily eliminated from potential development, their value and the economic dangers of their loss must be weighed against the values of these recreational resources.

We have gone into detail here simply to show that the BLM's decisions are not justified, that they did not resolve all doubt prior to an unsuitability determination, and that they did not use the "unsuitable" category only to screen out areas obviously excludable. Although certainly not the only one, this is one of the most dramatic cases of misapplication of the criteria.

We are encouraged by the recent clarifications of criterion 15 issued by the Associate Director of the BLM in his March 2 memorandum. We feel that if the criterion is applied in keeping with the redefinition of the exceptions and a realistic reappraisal of potential mitigations, there should be no problem in placing these areas within an "acceptable" category. In contrast to BLM's literal interpretations of the criterion, the Associate Director has defined "complete mitigation" in the following manner:

> "...replacement of wildlife habitat or population characteristics, using the best technology currently available, such that the habitat or populations will be essentially of the same quality and quantity as they were prior to the impacts necessitating mitigation. True, 'complete' mitigation, per se, is impossible to obtain under the current scientific state-of-the-art for wildlife management."

It is clear from this interpretation that mitigation can be successful and "complete", even with some minor wildlife losses.

The meaning of "adverse effects" has also been redefined as follows: "a situation where wildlife habitat or populations will be maintained at their present levels over an extended period of time."

We strongly believe that, on a long-term basis, wildlife populations can be maintained at their current levels.

Sage Grouse Strutting Grounds

Sage grouse, like antelope, are protected by criterion 15. As was also true in the case of the antelope, the BLM consulted with the Wyoming Game and Fish Department on a very limited basis. Again, although the criterion states federal lands, not all the strutting sites were on federal land. The buffer zones in this instance also have wide-ranging effects far beyond the quarter mile limit on adjacent private sections. Finally, the BLM did not inquire about any efforts to relocate strutting grounds despite the fact that recent Wyoming studies indicate this may be possible. In short, the criterion was applied without hesitation, the exception and possibility of mitigation casually dismissed.

Assuming even total removal of sage grouse habitat from the Red Rim-China Butte area, there would be no serious effects to this species on a regional basis. According to a BLM regional analysis for south-central Wyoming, there are 316,900 acres of crucial nesting habitat and well over 100 known strutting grounds in this area. BLM wildlife

biologists have noted that superior breeding habitat is present to the south of Red Rim-China Butte. It was estimated that over 20 times the number of strutting grounds encountered in Red Rim-China Butte were identified.

Criterion #16 Wetlands

Perhaps no criterion exemplifies the arbitrary nature of the classification process better than Wetlands. In discussions with BLM officials it was admitted to RMEC that the only applicable part of the Wetlands criterion was part 3, "riverine wetland systems, lower perennial and upper perennial systems with flow greater than five cubic feet per second..." The BLM began applying the criterion in November 1978, making flow measurement impossible, and there was no existing data. Nonetheless, Muddy, Fillmore and Separation Creeks were designated "unsuitable" as wetlands. No effort was made to determine if the streams were perennial or intermittent, if they have riparian values larger than one linear mile or if they have sufficient water flow to support water fowl, fish and game. In fact, both Fillmore and Separation Creeks are shown as intermittant on the U.S.G.S. topographic maps. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers considers such streams to contain less than five cubic feet per second flow.

What is particularly pernicious about this is that all wetlands are already fully protected under Section 404 of the Federal Waters Pollution Control Act. Both the Army Corps of Engineers and the EPA are assigned by this Act to administer over the use, management and protection of all

wetland areas. Permits will be issued only upon a showing that water quality and quantity, as well as fish and wildlife, will not be adversely affected.

BLM has not demonstrated that mining will "significantly affect the wetlands" or that reclamation will not provide complete restoration. In fact, the very designation of the areas as wetlands is highly suspect. Yet, once again, even though other agencies have specific statutory authority to regulate activity in such areas, they have been classified "unsuitable". The BLM action under these circumstances is tantamount to a policy that mining shall not take place where water is present.

Criterion #17 Floodplains

The MFP revisions classify areas around Muddy, Fillmore and Separation Creeks as floodplains and therefore unsuitable. In a March 2 discussion with local BLM officials they conceded that exception two to this criterion applied and that no lands should be excluded on this basis. We have not yet seen a revision indicating this change, but we feel certain it is correct and that the revision will be forthcoming. This is yet another illustration of the fact that where the criteria were applied easily, the exceptions were often overlooked.

Criterion #23 Alluvial Valley Floors

The BLM unilaterally devised their own method for determining what was an alluvial valley floor (AVF). This was done, RMEC

was told, because had they used the method specified in SMCRA as they were instructed, they would have had insufficient data and all suspected areas would have been "acceptable pending further study".

The method used did not identify AVF's "according to the definitions and standards of SMCRA, final alluvial floor guidelines, and approved State programs" as the Draft Programmatic EIS dictates. Instead, they formulated their own rudimentary tests. The proper tests for identifying AVF's and those called for in the criteria are specific and comprehensive. BLM's method is not an adequate alternative.

Furthermore, the methods used by BLM to identify AVF's and the conclusions they reached were not approved by the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality. This is a requirement of this criterion.

BLM did not demonstrate that mining what they identified as AVF's "would interupt, discontinue or preclude farming" as mandated in the criterion. They merely assumed that all mining activity would disturb whatever farming was present, and therefore classified the area as "unsuitable".

Before an area is classified by virtue of this criterion, it is essential that BLM consult with and obtain the concurrence of the Wyoming DEQ in making a determination. Secondly, BLM must adhere to the SMCRA provisions regarding AVF identification. And third, BLM must show what effect, if any, mining will have on farming. By insisting that this be done, RMEC is only asking that BLM comply with agency requirements.

Multiple Use

A number of sections and partial sections were designated as "unacceptable" as a result of multiple use considerations. This is worthy of note because in 1977 the entire area was determined to be "acceptable". The reason that formerly acceptable areas have been changed is twofold. First, the area under consideration was much smaller, and secondly, since multiple use decisions were being made in conjunction with the application of the unsuitability criteria, a bootstrapping effect occurred. The result was that far more land was excluded through multiple use analysis that would have been had the unsuitability criteria not been involved.

The multiple use determinations must be applied on a regional basis. By definition it is a trade-off process that takes an overall view. To do otherwise works to devalue any resource not available on a wide basis, in this instance coal. When viewed in a small area, it is difficult not to place a large value on the existing riparian habitat, for example. However, when a broader view is taken, it becomes apparent that riparian habitat of a similar or superior nature is plentiful within the region. Conversely, coal is found in only very small areas. In this framework, a trade-off that seems eminently reasonable when viewed in a vacuum becomes very costly when seen in proper perspective.

The BLM has admitted to RMEC in a public meeting that its multiple use decisions were affected by the fact that they were made contemporaneously with criteria application. This is probably a very human

reaction but its effect is to invalidate the intent of the program. In light of this admission, we believe the multiple use determinations should be reevaluated.

Additional Considerations

The difficulties listed above in RMEC's opinion pose serious problems for the Coal Management Program. In addition, we see several conceptual shortcomings which operate outside the application of the criteria but which nonetheless should be considered in the MFP.

The first of these problems is the potential economic impact on the area. If allowed to stand unmodified, the criteria render the entire Red Rim project unfeasible. The cost of this in terms of lost revenues is staggering. The estimated 30-year severance and production taxes would be $136,178,000. Over $10,000,000 in county property taxes and $6,000,000 in sales taxes would be lost. If tax revenues of this magnitude are to be lost in order to protect these resources, we suggest that the Governor should become involved in the process to determine if it is his judgment that such considerations outweigh the value of coal development. Such a tax loss should be at the end of a thorough examination with all available data utilized. In fact, the loss is now caused by a haphazard and arbitrary elimination process.

In performing their analysis, we think it is beyond BLM's jurisdiction to suggest that the inevitable result of mining is that conditions will occur that would violate state and/or federal standards, and therefore

areas should be designated "unsuitable". Statements such as "could degrade air quality"; "could degrade water quality"; "reclamation may not be able to restore aquifers", are not appropriate rationale for invoking the unsuitability criteria. The Wyoming DEQ, OSM and EPA all have authority as well as the expertise to make those determinations and would do so prior to actual commencement of mining.

The classification of federal lands also completely ignores the value of coal (with exception of the fact it should be considered in multiple use decisions). While the presence of a single sparrow hawk nest could result in an unsuitability determineation, this decision could not be overruled no matter how many tons of high quality coal are completely lost. Although no one advocates a situation where coal takes precedence over all other land uses, neither should it be the last in line of consideration. All potential resources must be considered in order to maximize the finite potential of the land. Ignoring the value of coal completely, inevitably gives other values a disproportionate effect on land use decisions.

The BLM completely failed to communicate with land owners on the private sections. Our discussions with these people have shown that severe changes in the environment are possible as a result of contemplated actions such as range modification and the fencing of entire sections. Should the surface owner fence the land, then Red Rim would cease to be the most critical winter range as BLM claims it is. Antelope would no longer have access to the area, and there would be no need for protection.

Certainly the cooperation of these people, or at least an understanding of their needs and desires with regard to the land, is absolutely necessary if proposed land use plans are to be meaningful in any real sense.

Finally, the checkerboard pattern of land ownership is never considered. Again, this is not the fault of local BLM personnel, for there is no directive that it should be any part of the evaluation process. If the land holding pattern in the Red Rim area was such that there were large blocks of federal and private lands, then the effect of declaring one section unsuitable would not be so costly in terms of private coal resources lost. In such a case, large areas of private and federal land would still be available in logical mining units. In the Overland District, when one federal section is eliminated, four to six contiguous private sections are also lost. The cost of this in lost resources is enormous.

Conclusions

After analyzing the process that led to the Overland MFP revision, the only conclusion that can be drawn is that a fair application of the criteria cannot be accomplished with the information presently available to BLM. The stated purpose of the process is to eliminate only areas that are blatantly unacceptable. As we have seen, however, its practical effect is much different. Those who formulated and implemented the process were cognizant that this was only the first step in an elaborate method of land evaluation. As a result, the analysis they applied was superficial.

Unfortunately, their conclusions were superficial also. The process of applying these criteria is so riddled with flaws that it is difficult to see how it can be redeemed by any number of revisions. In light of the fact that an adequate data base does not exist and that there are subsequent safeguards to protect competing land uses, a more desirable alternative would be to place these lands in the "acceptable pending further study" category.

This country is currently facing a host of energy-related problems. The President and Congress have often stated that the development of coal could help to solve many of them. The BLM states in the MFP revisions, "The coal in the acceptable areas could assist the nation in becoming less dependent upon foreign energy resources and, at the same time, contribute to better air quality due to the very low sulphur and ash content." That there are benefits to be derived from the coal in this region is beyond question.

Whether the social and environmental costs of producing this coal are unreasonably high is another question. The BLM says that in large areas the answer is "yes". If this is the case, then all of the coal in Red Rim will be lost. These comments have shown, we believe, that BLM's position in this regard is unsupportable. Operating without sufficient data and in areas outside their expertise and scope of responsibility, where their conclusions were guesses at best, they classified areas as "unsuitable". If BLM is incorrect, and we contend the evidence shows

that they are, then vital coal will be lost senselessly unless the conclusions are reversed.

RMEC would suggest that the process, instead of ending arbitrarily through use of the "unsuitable" designation, be allowed to continue by classifying these lands as "acceptable pending further study". The advantage to this is twofold. First, it maximizes coal production by making certain that all decisions are based on the best available data. This method insures that no coal will be lost because of unfounded fears. Secondly, while coal production is maximized, it occurs at no cost to alternate land uses. A variety of safeguards exist to protect the water, fish, wildlife, etc. In some cases the BLM would make these decisions, in others it would be other federal or state agencies. The ultimate decision then would be a joint effort on the part of all agencies involved (BLM, OSM, EPA, Wyoming DEQ, etc.). Each would add their specific area of expertise, assuring that every potential concern is voiced, and every problem resolved. To designate an area as "acceptable" at this stage allows planning and data collection to go forward, without increasing risk. This is surely a desirable alternative.

RMEC is committed to the production of coal in an environmentally responsible manner. We share the concerns voiced by the BLM. We differ with BLM only in that we believe that, in most areas, we can reduce any harmful effects completely, or to a minimal, acceptable level. In every case we believe that more information will be helpful and that the

importance of producing the coal justifies seeking this information. We cannot overemphasize our objections to the MFP Supplement, or our determination to see that all the issues raised are given due consideration. The Red Rim project, standing alone, is highly significant. The impact of the BLM process on this single project is heightened by the fact that the haphazard exclusionary process we have discussed could easily affect many other equally substantial projects in the same way. We remain convinced that cooperation between industry and government can and will provide the public with a more productive and balanced coal management program.

WYOMING MINING ASSOCIATION
PHONE (307) 635-0331
HITCHING POST INN
P.O. BOX 886
CHEYENNE, WYOMING 82001

STATEMENT

PRESENTED TO

THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

ON THE

PROPOSED MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN

FOR THE OVERLAND UNIT

by

WILLIAM H. BUDD, JR.
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT
THE WYOMING MINING ASSOCIATION

MARCH 22, 1979

WYOMING MINING ASSOCIATION
PHONE (307) 635-0331
HITCHING POST INN
P.O. BOX 860
CHEYENNE, WYOMING 82001

STATEMENT TO THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ON THE PROPOSED MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN FOR THE OVERLAND UNIT

My name is Bill Budd and I am the Executive Vice President of the Wyoming Mining Association. I represent the coal, uranium, iron ore, trona, bentonite and several other mineral producing companies in Wyoming.

The purpose of the Bureau of Land Management, as I see it, is to administer the public lands in such a way that the highest use of the public lands are used and to protect the public domain for future uses. With regard to your unsuitability criteria, you have unquestionably designated 24 important considerations for preserving the public lands, and I certainly support the concept of taking good care of our resources. I was born and raised in Wyoming and I love the wildlife and scenic wonders of my state. There is, however, a serious problem in how you are using your unsuitability criteria and the potential result of your actions could be not only impractical, but irresponsible.

It is your job to use these unsuitability criteria so that unique and valuable lands are not lost, but the results of your actions appear to be to stop the development of our energy and mineral resources, which should be one of the highest priorities for our public lands.

With regard to the Management Framework Plans (MFP's) that you have designated for coal leasing, it appears that you have designated a very small amount of public domain for coal leasing and then you apply your unsuitability criteria on those small tracts to see how much of these high potential coal lands should not be mined. You designated the MFP's

WYOMING MINING ASSOCIATION
PHONE (307) 635-0331
HITCHING POST INN
P.O. BOX 860
CHEYENNE, WYOMING 82001

designating high potential energy resource lands as the highest use for that land is irresponsible.

There are only two resources that allow any civilization to become powerful and healthy. They are the use of agricultural products and minerals. Without these two resources, civilization could not function and the civilizations that control these two raw products control other civilizations, as we can see from our history books, and as we can see today in the world politics. I only point this out to show that your job in administering the public lands is to assure that the highest use of the public lands are achieved and that our priorities for use of the public domain are not compromised. If the areas that contained high potential mineral desposits were so extensive that options were available, other uses of these lands may be justified. However, when the areal extent of our mineral potential is so limited, mineral extraction, and especially energy, should be the highest use of the public lands. There are many areas in Wyoming that are considered important for any or all of the criteria that have been designated as unsuitable. The BLM wilderness inventory lands alone comprise almost four times as much land as the strippable reserves of coal in Wyoming. I am not suggesting that other important values of our public lands be overlooked or disregarded. I firmly believe that where any of your unsuitable criteria exist on potential energy or mineral resource lands, that every effort be made to mitigate the conflicts, short of denying production of the resource.

WYOMING MINING ASSOCIATION
PHONE (307) 635-0331
HITCHING POST INN
P.O. BOX 860
CHEYENNE, WYOMING 82001

critical wintering area for antelope and has been designated unsuitable for mining. Not only have 10,000 acres of federal land been designated unsuitable, but an additional 10,000 acres of private land will probably never be mined. The first sixteen years of mining by the company would have disturbed only 1,749 acres. This includes all haul roads, office buildings, tipple site, as well as the actual pit acres. Obviously, only a little over 100 acres per year would be disturbed. Almost 20,000 acres have been withdrawn when only a little over 100 acres per year would have been affected by mining. Even if this area is a critical winter area for antelope, compromises could be made which would allow for the area to continue to serve as a critical area and allow for mining at the same time.

I hope that the Bureau of Land Management will work to achieve the best use of the public domain in the future, but before the best use can be achieved, the BLM and other responsible agencies must establish priorities that reflect the true needs of this country and the future of the people. I realize that you are under a lot of pressure from many special interest groups, including mine, and the public-at-large, but if the public lands are to be administered in a responsible fashion, the BLM and other government agencies responsible for the public domain will have to set hard priorities and not allow every popular movement to swey them onto a new course.

I shudder to think of what would happen to my state if the United States lost all of its imports of oil. I believe the popular opinion

WYOMING MINING ASSOCIATION
PHONE (307) 635-0331
HITCHING POST INN
P.O. BOX 860
CHEYENNE, WYOMING 82001

would then be to get energy as fast as possible, and that could result in the worst possible impact upon the wildlife and scenic areas of Wyoming imaginable. I hope that you set the hard priorities that will allow our public lands to be used in the best possible way, and then hold fast to what is right, rather than popular only for the present time.

Thank you for your attention to my statement.

MacPHERSON, GOLDEN & BROWN
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS
FIRST WYOMING BANK BUILDING
P. O. BOX 999
RAWLINS, WYOMING 82301

JOHN A. MacPHERSON
T. MICHAEL GOLDEN
BERNIT C. BROWN
CATHERINE L. DIRCK

AREA CODE 307
TELEPHONE 324-6606

RECEIVED
MAR 26 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

March 23, 1979

Mr. Fred Wolf
District Manager
Bureau of Land Management
P.O. Box 670
Rawlins, WY 82301

Re: Red Rim/China Butte/Federal Coal Management Program

Dear Mr. Wolf:

This letter is written on behalf of Mr. Taylor Lawrence relative to the application of the unsuitability criteria under the new federal coal management program as applied to the Red Rim/China Butte area southwest of Rawlins.

To fully appreciate and understand Mr. Lawrence's present situation some background may be in order. As you are aware, Congress in 1862, as an inducement for the construction of a transcontinental railroad and in hopes such action would facilitate the settlement of the West, passed legislation conveying title to the odd numbered sections to the Union Pacific on either side of the railroad. The major portion of these lands were then sold by the railroad to private individuals with the railroad reserving the minerals. Mr. Lawrence is a successor in interest to the Union Pacific's lands located in the Red Rim/China Butte area. Mr. Lawrence purchased the property for use in his livestock operations and has continued the historic use his predecessors of interest made of the land; that is, the running of steers. Not only does Mr. Lawrence own the surface on every other deeded section within the Red Rim/China Butte area but is the holder of the federal grazing privileges of the public lands consisting of the even numbered sections, alternating between the patented lands under grazing licenses issued by the United States pursuant to the Taylor Grazing Act.

As a surface owner of every other section and the holder of the grazing license on the alternate federal sections any decisions relative to the leasing of the federal mineral will have an obvious effect on Mr. Lawrence's operation. As a consequence, we have reviewed with more than passing interest the application of the unsuitability criteria to the federal

MAR 27 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

checkerboard lands within the Red Rim/China Butte area. Application of the unsuitability criteria to the site specific has resulted in the obvious foregone conclusion that a major portion of the alternate federally owned properties should not be put up for federal coal leases.

We would submit that the unsuitability criteria themselves and in particularly the application of the criteria to the Red Rim/China Butte area fails to really address the unique situation presented by the checkerboard land pattern. That is, implementation of the unsuitability criteria as proposed and as applied in this situation fails to give proper consideration to the alternate federal-private ownership. The proposed land use decision talks about the coal reserves located on federally owned lands but fails to take into consideration that the true amount of economically recoverable and marketable coal is actually twice that discussed. The coal is not located solely upon federal lands but also upon privately held property. Because of the unique land pattern found in the checkerboard it is readily apparent that what takes place on federal lands will effect what is done on the private lands and vice versa what takes place on the private lands will effect what occurs on the federal lands. The two are just too inter-related to have any other result. However, despite this obvious interrelation of private and federal interest Mr. Lawrence, as the holder of the surface on the private lands, was never contacted prior to the issuance of the proposed decision applying the unsuitability criteria. He is now forced with having to formulate his position and comments in a period of less than two weeks when in fact his interest are equal to those of the federal government as it relates to the future use of the property in question.

Mr. Lawrence sincerely believes that because of the inter-mingling of private and federal lands a joint effort between the federal interests, the private mineral interest, and the private land interest should be effected thereby assuring the following:

1. The development of energy related resources
2. The protection of the environment
3. The assurance of proper reclamation

Only with the joint effort of all three interested parties can the ultimate objective of the above criteria be met. Failure of any one entity to work jointly with the other interests can and will result in the nonobtainment of the above objectives for all parties in interest.

RECEIVED

Failure of the three ownership interests to jointly cooperate could and probably will result in some type of hopscotch development. While RME, the owner of the mineral estate, has indicated that coal development will not be affected if a federal leasing program is not carried out this may or may not, in the final analysis, be true. If it is not true than what Mr. Lawrence may expect is the development of coal reserves now owned by RME on the odd numbered sections. Thereafter it would be reasonable to expect by virtue of such development that unsuitability criteria as applied to the area could conceivably change the pending classification given to the land and the federal sections would be put up for lease. Coal development would then take place on the federal lands. The obvious interruption of such an unorganized development to Mr. Lawrence's ranching operations is obvious. Mr. Lawrence as the owner of the private surface is genuinely concerned about reclamation. However, he likewise recognizes that to forego the production of the coal deposits in the Red Rim/ China Butte area in our energy drained society should carefully be monitored.

Protection of the wildlife habitat seems to be all controlling in the application of the unsuitability criteria. However, let us submit to you what could happen if the joint efforts of all three interests are not unified. Mr. Lawrence has been considering the possibility of constructing a fence on his deeded lands and cultivating them to assure an increased grazing capacity. The construction of such a fence would have an obvious effect upon wildlife patterns within the area. This in and of itself may be reason enough to reconsider the application of the unsuitability criteria to the area.

It would appear that the application of the unsuitability criteria has resulted in a negative assessment of the area for three primary reasons. That is, air quality, reclamation issues and wildlife considerations. We would respectfully submit that these issues are under the present jurisdiction of OSM offices and the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality. Based upon previous experiences these agencies have proven themselves to be well equipped to handle the problems involving such matters.

In conclusion we would respectfully submit that the application and the development of the unsuitability criteria to the checkerboard land area is inappropriate. We would further submit that the time within which the landowner has been permitted to comment has not be sufficient and that his interests have not been given proper consideration in light of the unique land pattern involved.

We would respectfully submit that the Red Rim/China Butte area should be classified as acceptable pending further study. Finally, we feel that the decision as proposed cannot be defended in Court which, we understand, is the directive under which the criteria was to be developed and implemented.

We appreciate having been given the opportunity, although somewhat short in time, to comment and sincerely hope that our comments will be considered.

Respectfully submitted,

John A. MacPherson

JAM/sw

cc: Talyor Lawrence

BURTON W. MARS[illegible]
370 No. 9th S[illegible]
Laramie, W[illegible]

Jan. 225 1979

Fred Wolf, Distroct Manager,
Bureau of Land Mgt. Dept. Interior
Rawlins District Office, Rawlins, Wyo. 82301

DearMr. Wolf:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter and. add map concerning certain portions of Southwestern Wyoming Planning Units,- including the Red Rim/China Butte and Hanna Basin areas to be reviewed to determine areas acceptable for potential coal development and areas which are unsuitable for same.

Thank you for sending me this information and for the invitation to participate in the planning effort in the near future.

I am interested in these proposed studies, particularly that of the Hanna Basin area, with which I am quite familiar. I shall be glad to receive any further information you may have on these areas and the potentials involved, and with the help of others with whom I may be associated will endavor to hr of some help to your office in making decisions as to your recommendation,s.

Sincerely yours,

Burton W. Marston

Burton W.Marston, Secretary
Wyoming Division, IWLA

Copy to Green River Chapter, IWLA.

RECEIVED
MAR 22 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

Sierra Club NORTHERN GREAT PLAINS OFFICE
PO Box 1078, Lander, WY 82520
March 19, 1979

Fred Wolf, District Manager
Bureau of Land Management
Rawlins District
PO Box 670
Rawlins, Wy. 82301

Dear Fred Wolf,

I would like to submit the following comments for the record on the application of lands unsuitability criteria to the Hanna Basin area and Red Rim-China Butte area.

First, I want to compliment your agency for its willingness to recognize that some portions of these areas are unsuitable for mining. It is incredible to think that the existing management framework plans for these areas would have allowed coal development in alluvial valley floors, along the shores of Seminoe Reservoir, next to the interstate highway and in eagle nesting sites. The fact that the BLM was able to find so many areas that are clearly unsuitable for mining illustrates the past gross inadequacy of the BLM's coal leasing process.

The supplements to these MFPs represent a good start at patching up the coal planning process--but I feel it is a false start as well. The Department of the Interior is still in the process of devising a coal management plan to satisfy the court order in the Natural Resources Defense Council v. Hughes case. The application of lands unsuitability criteria to coal lands before the criteria have been finalized and before the judge has approved the revised impact statement and lifted his injunction is a violation of the court order. (See attached notice from the case plaintiffs to Sec. Andrus.)

As well as being illegal, the premature application of the lands unsuitability criteria poses other serious problems.

1) The state has not been given adequate time to come up with "state lands unsuitable" (criteria 20) and "state proposed criteria", (criteria 21). How can the BLM apply the state criterion when the state hasn't had an adequate chance to promulgate them?

2) None of the criterion that are being applied in these MFP supplements have been finalized. The Sierra Club and others have recommended changes in and additions to the proposed criterion that appeared in the Federal Register and the draft environmental statement on the Federal Coal Management Program. The final criterion have not been adopted and released by the Secretary. So how can the BLM apply the criterion?

3) In many cases I don't believe the BLM has adequate inventory information necessary to apply the criterion. The criterion were first proposed to the public in

100% Recycled Paper

December 1978. During the past three harsh winter months I can't believe that the BLM has had an adequate opportunity to survey the thousands of acres involved to judiciously apply the criterion. Some of the information necessary was gathered for the original MFP, but much of it is still missing.

4) None of the sites in either area were judged unsuitable due to unreclaimability (criteria 24). I find this hard to believe in light of the thin soils, low precipitation, and lack of proof of reclaimability in the coal basin.

5) Some information on how to apply the criterion is not available. For example, the Office of Surface Mining still hasn't finalized technical guidelines on how to identify alluvial valley floors. Without this basic information how can the BLM decide how large of an area around a valley floor to declare unsuitable?

6) The checkerboard land ownership pattern in the area poses a unique problem, but also a unique opportunity for resource managers. The BLM's approach to the problem is to make federal lands available to avoid by-pass and just survey federal lands for unsuitability. I believe the BLM has the responsibility to inventory the suitability and unsuitability of interspersed private and state lands and then designate federal lands unsuitable if such designation would effectively block development of non-federal lands that should be off limits. For example, if there is an eagle nest on private land the BLM should designate the surrounding federal parcels unsuitable so that it would be uneconomic for a developer to mine the private parcel. By refusing to recognize the interrelationship of these lands the BLM is facilitating environmental destruction of non-federal lands.

7) The preferred alternative in the draft EIS on coal management calls on the BLM to review all coal lands before focussing down on certain ones that might be acceptable to lease. By applying the criteria to the lands in these MFP supplements the BLM is undercutting and short-circuiting the preferred alternative and focussing on lands where industry has expressed an interest in leasing. This is a fall back to the old EMARS system, which was rejected by the public, the Carter Administration, and the courts.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Bruce Hamilton

Bruce Hamilton
Northern Great Plains Representative

HALF CIRCLE CATTLE CO., INC.
1945 WESTWOOD HILL PHONE (307) 234-1200
CASPER, WYOMING 82601

RECEIVED
FEB 07 1979
[redacted]

February 6, 1979

Mr. Fred Wolf
District Manager
Bureau of Land Management
P. O. Box 670
Rawlins, Wyoming 82301

Dear Mr. Wolf:

I am in receipt of your letter of January 25, 1979 with reference to the Red Rim/China Butte BLM claim.

I would appreciate your keeping me informed as to what progress is being made and what meetings are being held.

Sincerely,

M. T. Lawrence, Jr.

M. T. Lawrence, Jr.
President

MTL:kf

P. S. Please note, my new address is: 1945 Westwood Hill, Casper, Wyoming, 82601. Phone No. 307-234-1200

Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.

917 15TH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005
202 737-5000

Western Office
3543 YALE STREET
PALO ALTO, CALIF. 94306
415 387-1080

New York Office
122 EAST 42ND STREET
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10017
212 949-0049

RECEIVED
MAR 22 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

February 15, 1979

The Honorable Cecil D. Andrus
Secretary of the Interior
U.S. Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

On behalf of the Natural Resources Defense Council, Environmental Defense Fund, Northern Plains Resource Council, Powder River Basin Resource Council, plaintiffs in Natural Resources Defense Council v. Hughes, this will advise you that we believe the Department to be in violation of the final order of the court in that case, 437 F.Supp. 981 (D.D.C. 1977), as amended 454 F.Supp. 149 (D.D.C. 1978), appeal pending. Despite the court's explicit command to the contrary, the Department has chosen and begun to implement a coal leasing program long in advance of completion of the required Programmatic Impact Statement.

The Department's own memoranda reveal that the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has initiated a systematic and vigorous program to prepare for a mid-1980 coal lease sale. 806,000 acres of land in four western states are being reviewed specifically and solely to prepare for coal leasing activity. Ten Management Framework Plans, prepared for coal leasing under the EMARS II system, are being updated using Lands Unsuitability Criteria never promulgated and published in the Draft Programmatic Impact Statement as draft criteria. This massive commitment to a 1980 lease sale is totally inconsistent with a decisional process purportedly focussed upon the Draft Programmatic Impact Statement.

The issue in NRDC v. Hughes was the adequacy of the final Environmental Impact Statement prepared on the Energy Minerals Activities Recommendation System (EMARS II). The Court concluded that the EIS was inadequate. It found both the explanation of EMARS II and the consideration of alternatives to be insufficient. The court specifically referred to the necessity that the Department consider the need for any leasing at all, and ordered the Department to prepare a new draft impact statement and the Secretary of the Interior to

73
100% Recycled Paper

> personally reevaluate federal coal leasing policy, based on information contained in the new final EIS, and to make a new decision as to whether a new leasing program shall be instituted and, if so, what kind of program it should be.

Natural Resources Defense Council v. Hughes, supra, 437 F. Supp. at 994 (emphasis supplied).

Until that task is complete, the Department is enjoined from taking "any steps whatsoever, directly or indirectly, to implement the new coal leasing program . . . ." 437 F.Supp. at 993.

As you know, plaintiffs subsequently agreed to language modifying the court's order, which was approved by the court on June 13, 1978. The order as amended permits the Department to

> prepare comprehensive land use plans as long as they do not recommend the leasing of any tracts of federal coal; however the plans can consider present and potential uses of the public lands.

454 F.Supp. at 152. The Department has apparently concluded that the court's order forbids only implementation of EMARS II and the identification or leasing of tracts. 43 Fed. Reg. 57663 (December 8, 1978); Memorandum from the Deputy Solicitor to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management "Planning and Data Collection Efforts under NRDC v. Hughes," at 1-2. Such a conclusion is incredible in the context of the decision of the court. The order of the court explicitly bars implementation of "the new" (emphasis supplied) coal leasing program; the point of the order is to compel the Department to properly complete the EIS process before it adopts, let alone implements, a new program, be it EMARS II or any other.

The language which permits land use planning to go forward is addressed to comprehensive planning which incidentally involves consideration of coal. Yet the Department has instituted planning activities the sole purpose of which is to facilitate the early renewal of coal leasing.

Almost a year ago, the Department instructed state Directors to direct "present work efforts into those planning units which offer the best opportunity for near future coal resource management," and emphasized that it "is particularly important that we place FY 78-79 emphasis towards meeting the mid-1980 objective for leasing, if required." Instruction Memorandum No. 78-157, March 27, 1978.

A few months later, an Office of Coal Management document identified

> 2.4 million acres in six western states which under existing planning criteria are suitable for coal leasing. These areas will require the least amount of effort to update and refine in accordance with the departmental policy and suitability criteria after July 1978.

Supplement to Planning and Budget for Coal Leasing 1978-1980, June 9, 1978, p. 2. The document discussed "a recommended approach for activity planning to meet the 1980 coal leasing goals," id., p. 1, and outlined specific steps to be taken. Id., pp. 3-5. The document repeatedly refers to production of a "Departmental policy on coal leasing by July 1978." Id., p. 1, also see pp. 2, 4.

It is significant that the document's authors contemplate the completion of the Department's coal policy in July 1978 (five months before the new draft EIS was even published). In a Memorandum dated June 30, 1978, the selection of the "Preferred Alternative" was announced. Memorandum from Executive Secretary "Secretarial Issue Document, Coal Policy Issues and Options." The Bureau of Land Management almost immediately began to implement the new policy.* In a memorandum addressing "Planning for Mid-80 Coal Leasing, If Needed," the Director of the BLM instructed the State Directors of Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming, consistent with the "leasing strategies preferred by the Department," to complete all of the steps necessary for leasing, short of tract identification, by June 1, 1979:

---

*/ It was not however full scale resource management which was initiated, but the limited coal oriented program months later referred to the DES in a cryptic section headed "Start-up Special Considerations" (DES, p. 3-28).

> The purpose of this memorandum is to stimulate the inventory and planning effort required to place the Bureau in the position of being ready to identify tracts to be analyzed by June 1, 1979, for coal lease offer in mid-1980 if needed.
>
> You have been furnished with the Solicitor's opinion of May 22 which provides legal guidance and advises we can develop plans under the court order of September 27, 1977, to the extent that we identify lands suitable for coal leasing in a planning unit.
>
> You have recently developed MFP's for some areas of medium or high potential for coal development in the last several years. High priority planning units have been identified to the task force on planning/budget, and additional funds for planning in FY 1979 have been requested. A number of coal-planning positions have been allocated to you during the last several years for continuing such efforts. We know the leasing strategies preferred by the Department will all rely on the surface management agencies' planning systems to identify areas suitable for coal leasing; this can be done by June 1, 1979.
>
> We would like to use the period of September 1978 through March 1979 to review and revise the areas planned for coal only in selected recently completed MFP's on high potential coal deposits, to insure that these plans are consistent with current Departmental policy and ready to use in developing the mid-1980 coal lease offer options. Doing this will involve the following steps, to be completed by March 1979[.]

Instruction Memorandum No. 78-381, July 19, 1978 (emphasis in original).

The process described in Instruction Memorandum 78-381 constitutes implementation of the "preferred alternative," and it is not a part of a general and comprehensive land use planning process. It is solely and specifically designed to prepare for a mid-1980 coal lease sale. IM 78-381 does not order consideration of coal resources in the context of resource management activities. It explicitly cautions the State Directors "to review and revise the areas planned for coal only . . . ." (emphasis in original). The 800,000 acres selected to be reviewed as part of this program have not been selected pursuant to comprehensive resource planning. There has been no intraregional evaluation of competing values. The criterion by which the selection was made was simple. "Focus on planning areas where completed MFPs delineate areas potentially suitable for coal leasing to meet short-term (1980) leasing goals." Supplement to Planning and Budget for Coal Leasing 1978-1980, June 9, 1978, p. 5.

After meeting with the State Directors, the Director issued further instructions specifying that the review and revision process should "include acreage sufficient to result in at least 10 potential lease tracts . . ." in each of four states. He added that the "exact process" for "a 1980 sale has not yet been designed. This is a major priority for the Office of Coal Management, in cooperation with OCLPC, over the next two months." Facsimile Message No. 78-85, September 21, 1978.

BLM State offices responded with a flurry of activity. The Colorado State Director advised the Director of BLM that although fiscal year 1978 was nearly over, leaving "a short time frame to complete the work," the Colorado State Office might "be able to update existing MFPs to allow for a subsequent coal-lease offer in mid-1980." This he attributed to the existence of "the West-Central Colorado Coal ES and Northwest Colorado Coal supplemental report covering the planning units where leasing is anticipated . . . ." He noted that "within these general areas, we have specific tracts identified." Memorandum from State Director, Colorado, to Director, August 7, 1978 (emphasis supplied).

The Montana State Director in three separate memoranda to the Director reviewed his plans to "facilitate an adequate supply of areas acceptable for further consideration for leasing" but complained that the "[t]imeframes for tract identification, selection, ranking, regional ES, and sales schedule are too compressed, but the situation is understood."

Memorandum from State Director, Montana, to Director, November 24, 1978, at 2-3. He noted that the need for haste might lead to "a less than adequate [regional environmental] analysis," Memorandum from State Director, Montana, to Director, September 26, 1978, at 1, and that it would be necessary to "rely heavily" on existing and possibly insufficient data. Memorandum from State Director, Montana, to Director, August 15, 1978, at 1.

A major step in preparations for a mid-1980 lease sale is the application of the draft Lands Unsuitability Criteria. See 43 Fed. Reg. 57662, et seq. (Dec. 8, 1978); 44 Fed. Reg. 2201-2202 (Jan. 10, 1979); DES, p. 5-141. Although the criteria are an integral part of the preferred alternative, they are being applied before they have been formally promulgated and fully exposed to public review and comment. The Department has characterized the application of the criteria as "test" and asserted that, because it can "change the MFPs if necessary to comply with the final regulations," the "process does not irretrievably or irreversibly commit any resources." 43 Fed. Reg. 57664 (Dec. 8, 1978).

The urgency of the Department's efforts to prepare for a mid-1980 lease sale renders that assertion ridiculous even if technically correct. Substantial changes in the criteria would require major revisions; major revisions that would have to take place during the summer and fall of 1979. The Department's planning documents state that in order for the mid-1980 lease sale to take place application of the criteria must be completed by April 15, 1979, Facsimile Message 78-85, September 21, 1978, p. 2, and revision of the MFPs must be completed by June 1979. See Instruction Memo 78-381, July 19, 1978. Thus, any meaningful change in the criteria would render leasing in 1980 impossible.

The consequence of the massive effort to be ready to lease by mid-1980 is that a coal leasing program is being implemented, once again without prior consideration of the need for and effects of leasing. However careful the analysis in the final programmatic impact statement may be, it will come more than a year too late. It is inconceivable that the program, already forging ahead on the tight schedule, with an enormous commitment of resources, will be cancelled or significantly modified in response to the comments.

Because of the demand for haste, the EMARS II process is still being used. The lands being reviewed are those subject to ten existing MFPs. Those MFPs were prepared and updated for use under EMARS II, not the sustained yield, multiple use mandate of FLPMA, or the environmental requirements of the President's Environmental Message and SMCRA. The data they provide was collected to answer questions asked under EMARS II, not the "preferred alternative." The decisions they reflect were EMARS II decisions, yet the Director of the BLM has instructed the State Directors that the updating process "should, in effect, confirm prior planning decisions or, if justified, include areas not previously recommended for potential coal development." Facsimile Message 79-4, to Colorado, Montana, Utah and Wyoming State Directors, Oct. 13, 1978, p. 1.

We regard the Department's actions as described above to be a violation of the court's order. The Department's memoranda and actions suggest that the decision to lease in mid-1980 was made before the basic tasks imposed by the court were addressed in a programmatic impact statement and subject to public review. These actions threaten to turn the programmatic impact statement into an effort to justify a decision to lease in mid-1980 rather than provide the Secretary with the options available for a federal coal leasing program.

As we stated in our comments on the DES, we believe that the general structure of the preferred alternative has merit as a resource management structure. We are eager to contribute to the Department's efforts to develop such a structure, but we believe that the activities we have identified in the preceding pages are undermining these efforts.

We would be very pleased to have an opportunity to meet with you to discuss our concerns.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Lash

Jonathan Lash — For: Patrick Sweeney, Northern Plains Resource Council
Sarah Goren, Powder River Basin Resource Council
Paula Phillips, Environmental Defense Fund

cc: Guy Martin, Assistant Secretary of the Interior
Frank Gregg, Director, Bureau of Land Management
Steve Quarles, Director, Office of Coal Leasing Policy

Fred Wolfe

3-25-79

COMMENTS ON THE USE OF THE PROPOSED UNSUITABILITY CRITERIA ON FEDERAL COAL LANDS

The 24 points of recommended unsuitability criteria will affect private interest to the point that private land will not be able to be developed for mining activity; both underground and surface. The general appearance of the criteria seems to more directly affect surface mining activities than underground mining, although, no thought has been given to subsidence; and within the BLM it may be a major factor for allowing areas to be mined.

It is our opinion that subsidence in any mining areas would not significantly affect the points as listed as criteria.

With the great need for energy production in the United States to convert to other sources than foreign imports, there must be almost unlimited ability to lease energy containing federal lands in order for our free enterprizing system to keep up with demands. The most economic properties in this type of management must be mined first. This is determined by a bidding process between energy companies or individual power generation companies and individuals, not by the United States Government. We live in a free country and not a controlled, socialistic country.

The criterion on federal land systems should be worked around, as mining will not destroy the area forever with the available reclamation techniques. Mining may take a small area out of use for federal land systems for a short period of time, but then be returned to the system upon complete reclamation. This would make all natural resources available to this country in time of need.

The criterion on scenic areas is too far reaching, in that there are no definite guidelines as to how to determine if something is scenic.

The criterion on historic sites and natural areas should be handled in the same way the areas which are covered with water by large dams are.

The criterion on State listed endangered species should be limited to the federal list, at least, and in most cases, these special would move to another area.

The criterion on Bald and Golden Eagle nests, roosts, and concentration areas; Falcon cliff nesting sites, should be reviewed in that when the birds increase in number, they must find new nesting areas. Thus, it is only logical that if we mine in an area, they could relocate nearby and, with the proper reclamation techniques, they could return to the area after mining.

The criterion on State resident fish and wildlife should be changed so that they would not shutoff mining unless reclamation could not be accomplished.

In the Eastern United States, rivers and creeks have been moved and diverted successfully without causing environmental problems. Thus, the resident fish could be saved and also dancing and strutting grounds for Sage Grouse, Sharp-Tailed Grouse, Prairie Chicken, winter ranges for deer, antelope and elk and migration corridors for elk could work around a mining area which is short duration.

All of these criterion could even adversely affect the installation of an underground mine because of roads to and from the mine site and outside facilities for the underground mine.

Reclamation of an area may not mean restoration to the original topography because other topography may be more desirable for wildlife and revegetation. This can be seen in areas of the Eastern and Central United States.

Carbon County Coal Co.
P.O. Box 370
Hanna, Wyo. 82327

John A. Thiel

RECEI
MAR 26 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

1730 Miramont Drive
Fort Collins, Colorado 80524
March 22, 1979

Mr. Fred Wolfe
Bureau of Land Management
Rawlins District
P. O. Box 670
Rawlins, Wyoming 82301

Dear Fred:

After reviewing your "Proposed Revisions to the Overland MFP Land Use Decisions" and listening to the various presentations at our meeting on Friday, March 2, I have some serious reservations with regard to the tentative decisions that have been made. I hope you will consider the comments that I have enclosed with this letter. I have tried to view it not only as a scientist, but as an American citizen who is concerned with the limited supply of fossil fuels and the cost of those fuels.

Thank you very much for your consideration of these comments. I wish you the best of luck in your deliberations. I know it will be an extremely difficult task; and whatever the final outcome, no one will be completely satisfied.

Sincerely,

John L. Schmidt, PhD
Wildlife Biology

JLS:ew
Enclosure

March 22, 1979

RECEIV
MAR 26 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

RESPONSE TO BLM'S PROPOSED REVISIONS TO
THE OVERLAND MFP LAND USE DECISIONS

Introduction

As I have reviewed the revisions and specifically the unsuitability criteria, three general problems have been apparent. One relates to definitions, another to the value system defined by the criteria, and, lastly, to the apparent complete lack of consideration given to mitigation procedures.

The criterion relating to state resident fish and wildlife states that only "the most critical winter ranges for deer, antelope, and elk" will be considered unsuitable. Nowhere is "most critical" defined. I would interpret it as being a small part of the winter range as defined by the Wyoming Game and Fish Department. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) apparently has included essentially all winter range into this "most" critical category.

If the criterion is concerned about deer or pronghorn as a species, certainly there is little cause to worry as I'll point out in the section "Impact on Species." However, BLM has apparently interpreted species to mean any herd or herd unit.

Regarding the value system defined by the criterion, numerous economic studies have been conducted on the value of wildlife species, particularly on big game. While these values are considered high by most standards, they generally would not compare favorably to values for the several million tons of coal which may underlie part of their habitat. Furthermore, as energy resources become more precious, these values will likely increase faster than those of wildlife. The unsuitability criteria leave no room for compromise, however. In effect, someone has made the decision that one kestrel is more valuable than all of the coal underlain within a 1/4 mile radius of

its nest. I'm not sure most Americans would agree with this value judgment, especially when there is no heat in their home.

Lastly, it is obvious that virtually no thought has been given whatsoever to mitigation procedures. A considerable amount of research has been conducted which deals with habitat improvement techniques which may prove to more than mitigate short term loss of wildlife habitat through mining activities. The subject will be covered in greater detail in the section "Potential Mitigation Procedures."

BLM's Data Base

I have briefly reviewed BLM's techniques for gathering data relating to wildlife species. Generally, I have more confidence in their data relating to raptors than to their big game information. Certainly the criteria dealing with migratory birds, bald and golden eagle nests, and falcon cliff nesting sites are more specific than that pertaining to state resident fish and wildlife. For example, a golden eagle nest is relatively easy to find and determine whether or not it is active; this is a yes or no, black or white situation. However, to determine whether any given habitat is essential to the existence of a species, or if it is "most critical" winter range (especially when these terms aren't defined) is infinitely more difficult.

I have not seen a detailed description of BLM's methodology for determining that "most critical" winter range exists for pronghorn and mule deer in the area. As I understand, several aerial flights were made over suspected concentration areas and several hundred animals were counted. This number was then divided by the estimated number of animals in the herd unit to arrive at the percentage of the herd unit believed residing on the proposal area. There are many possible sources of bias in this technique.

Pronghorn normally are harassed by low flying aircraft and may run for a considerable distance. Any experienced observer would agree that its' not unlikely that the same herd may be counted two or three times even though the sample strip may be a half mile apart. Furthermore, since standard statistical procedures were not employed, there is no estimate of variability, and confidence limits cannot be placed around the estimate. A second source of error is the technique used to estimate population size for the herd unit. I know what techniques are employed by the Wyoming Game and Fish Department. The estimates are very rough at best. Since the technique is not statistically valid, again no confidence limits can be placed around the estimate. If the same census technique had been used for the entire range of the herd unit and the Red Rim, China Buttes area, more confidence could be placed in the percentage of herd unit residing on the proposal area. However, this was not the case.

I see no data indicating it is even known for sure the animals inhabiting the proposed site are even part of the herd unit in question. This is only an assumption. Frequently when such assumptions are tested, they are found to be false. The only way this can be verified is by conducting migration studies of the herd in question. A few animals from selected areas of the summer herd unit range would need to be marked with colored collars or radio transmitters and their movements studied through the course of the winter.

This is not to say the area is not an important wintering area for pronghorn. It may well be. However, because of the manner in which the number of animals in the herd unit and the number of animals in the proposal area were estimated and the lack of data relative to herd migration, definitive statements concerning the relative importance of this area to a particular herd are not possible.

Possible Mitigation Procedures

As indicated earlier, little obvious effort was made to consider mitigation procedures. I would like to point out several techniques that could and should have been given more consideration. Because of time constraints, I will not go into details at this time. However, a thorough literature review would reveal that the mitigation of many of these techniques have been quantified for some species in selected habitat types. The following are techniques that should be considered:

1. Fertilization of areas adjacent to the mining site could be used to increase productivity of forage and thereby increase carrying capacities for big game.
2. Application of charcoal to snow has been used experimentally to reduce snow depth to allow big game access to forage.
3. Snow fences also have been used to keep forage areas normally exluded to big game open during severe winter storms.
4. Supplementary feeding on areas adjacent to mine site could be used. This technique has been used for years in Wyoming to increase the natural carrying capacity for big game.
5. Underpasses on railways and haul roads have been proven to significantly reduce accidental mortality.
6. Mineral needs may be supplemental with "salt" blocks.
7. Water catchments have been used to better distribute big game at all seasons of the year to avoid range depletion around watering holes and to increase carrying capacity.
8. Artificial raptor nests and perches have been successfully used in several areas to increase raptor numbers where natural nests and perch sites do not exist.

9. Livestock numbers could be reduced which would increase the carrying capacity for big game.

These are some examples of mitigation techniques that should have been considered. Additional effort would likely reveal other possibilities.

Impact on Species

The impact of mining on wildlife species seems to have been greatly exaggerated as a result of the federal unsuitability criteria. The assumption appears to be that the wildlife existing on the area will be totally eliminated forever should mining occur. I would like to briefly comment on the anticipated effect on wildlife on the short and long term.

1. Short term. Certainly there will be complete habitat destruction on the short term. However, it is important to note that at any one time a relatively small percentage of the total area will be so disturbed. The remainder of the area will be either undisturbed or in the process of being reclaimed. Many species respond quickly to the reclaimed land. For example, I have seen pronghorn foraging in a reclaimed area within a year after reclamation was begun.

   Considering the short term impacts to most species, the impact is almost miniscule. For example, in North America the most recent estimate of the pronghorn population is 400,000. Let's assume that there really are 1,000 pronghorn wintering in the proposed area as BLM estimated and that all die because of lack of forage, no mitigation, no reclamation, and they wouldn't move to a different area. This would only constitute one-fourth of one percent of the population! Considering the population in the State of Wyoming, this would still constitute less than one percent of the population. Through mitigation,

reclamation, and temporary movements of animals away from the mine site, even this minor impact should be greatly reduced. The same general impacts should hold true for other wildlife species in the area, including raptors, mule deer, sage grouse, and waterfowl.

2. Long term. With proper reclamation, the long term effects on wildlife species should be negligible. If the topography is contoured to its original shape and native vegetation can be re-established, the wildlife species should be maintained at, near, or perhaps above current population levels. One exception to this may be nesting sites for some raptorial birds. I don't know and I'm not sure if anyone does know how specific are their needs relative to rock outcroppings and other unique geologic features or the state of the art with regard to reclamation of such features.

Summary and Recommendations

There is considerable room for doubt in BLM's "Revision to the Overland MFP Land Use Decisions." The inadequacy of big game census techniques, methods used to determine "most critical" winter ranges, lack of consideration of mitigation procedures, minor or negligible impacts on species, among other reasons cast numerous questions on the wisdom of these decisions.

I recommend beginning as soon as possible in conducting a research project to estimate the population size of the total big game herd unit and the migration and concentration patterns at all seasons of the year using statistically valid procedures. In addition, steps should be taken immediately to begin implementing mitigation procedures to establish that productivity of these ranges can be increased for big game and, furthermore, that an increase of winter carrying capacities can be demonstrated. Mitigation procedures for other wildlife of interest, such as sage grouse and raptors, should also be started soon to establish their reliability.

John L. Schmidt, PhD

PALM LIVESTOCK CO.
ELK MOUNTAIN, WYO. 82324

26 March 1979

State Director (912)
Bureau of Land Management
Box 1828
Cheyenne, WY 82001

Dear Sir:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments on your proposed supplements to the Wyoming Land Use Decisions, (re: coal development on BLM administered lands in the Hanna Area and the Overland Area of the Rawlins District). I do so hesitantly and guardedly--because most coal development so far accomplished in this district has been on lands grazed by Palm Livestock Co. The surface owner-strip mining problems that have arisen have been ours, with no known expertise available or precedent to guide us.

I can write comfortably with the advantage of having heard your presentation and the testimony it drew in Rawlins Thursday evening 14 March 1979. My initial reaction was as negative as is your approach to decision-making.

We have studied today's problems in this area since Arch erected the first drag-line nearly a decade ago. We don't know all the answers yet--nor will we ever; but the nation has chosen coal as the first alternative to imported petroleum energy. Our experience should at least permit us to simplify our logic.

"Energy efficiency" has become a household phrase--the 55 m.p.h. speed limit; well insulated houses; car pools; and turning the thermostat down. Synonimous to patriotism, it should also apply to mining techniques. If we are going to live on this planet as long as we want to, we are going to use all of the energy we can find. Every ton of coal we can extract from the earth will be burned, and we would be wise to extract it efficiently.

There lies the fallacy of your decision-making process. If development of these coal reserves is national policy, the BLM should encourage their orderly development with positive decisions and positive criteria--not screen potential development with 24 "unsuitability" criteria. Your efforts should be orchestrated with those of the Department of Energy to the cadence of national policy, once established.

"Highest and best use" of the land is the goal we set; shouldn't we assign some of our priorities to economic considerations?

I await your answer in the decisions you apply to Hanna and to Overland.

Respectfully,

Norman Palm
President

NP:dpj

RECEIVED
Kelly
APR 13 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

THE STATE OF WYOMING

ED HERSCHLER
GOVERNOR

Game and Fish Department

CHEYENNE, WYOMING 82002

EARL M. THOMAS
DIRECTOR

April 12, 1979

Fred Wolf, District Manager
Rawlins District Office
Bureau of Land Management
P. O. Box 670
Rawlins, Wyoming 82301

EIS 236: Supplement to
Wyoming Land Use Decisions
Determinations of Unsuitability
for Coal Development-Hanna Area

Dear Mr. Wolf:

Having reviewed the Management Framework Plans Supplement for the Hanna Planning Unit, we feel that BLM has properly applied the unsuitability criteria for coal development in the area. We concur with the proposed 2,000-foot buffer zone proposed along Seminoe Reservoir, the Medicine Bow River, and Austin Creek.

We realize that ongoing work by BLM and the Wyoming Game and Fish Department will improve our knowledge of wildlife distribtuion and critical habitat, and may result in delineation of additional unsuitable areas for mining. It appears at this time that consideration for wildlife is in line with existing data under the current criteria.

If we can be of further assistance, do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

W. Donald Dexter

W. DONALD DEXTER,
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
WYOMING GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT

WDD/HBM/mlr

cc: Game Division
Fish Division

NOTE: This comment is for the Hanna review area only.

RECEIVED
Kelly
APR 13 1979
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
RAWLINS DISTRICT

THE STATE OF WYOMING

ED HERSCHLER
GOVERNOR

Game and Fish Department

CHEYENNE, WYOMING 82002

EARL M. THOMAS
DIRECTOR

April 9, 1979

EIS 237, Red Rim/China Butte
Coal Unsuitability Review
Area

Mr. Fred Wolf, District Manager
Rawlins District Office
Bureau of Land Management
P. O. Box 670
Rawlins, Wyoming 82301

Dear Mr. Wolf:

We offer the following comments on the proposed coal leasing being considered in the proposed Land Use Decision Changes for the Red Rim/China Butte Area.

Critical Habitats

Habitat known to be critical to the maintenance of resident populations of pronghorn antelope, mule deer, and sage grouse is delineated on the map attached. This does not differ greatly from habitat known to the Rawlins office of the Bureau of Land Management.

Critical habitat for pronghorn within the coal lease area consists of a winter range along Red Rim north and east of Separation Creek, and a significant portion of the Muddy Creek Winter Range west of China Butte. Observations during the winters of 1977-78 and 1978-79 indicate that the Red Rim Winter Range is essential, due to its topography and vegetative cover, for the survival of 600-1,200 animals (9-18%) of the Baggs antelope herd. That portion of the Muddy Creek critical winter range included in the China Butte lease supports 30-600 pronghorn, up to 7% of the Baggs antelope herd.

Only a small portion of the coal lease area near China Butte is considered critical winter range for mule deer. However, this range supports an estimated 120 mule deer, approximately 1% of the Baggs mule deer herd. A smaller proportion of the population winters on Red Rim, but the rim is not essential winter range for a large proportion of the herd.

Two sage grouse strutting grounds are known to exist in the coal lease area. The existence of these grounds in an undisturbed state is essential to the maintenance of associated sage grouse populations. Sage grouse populations also require

nesting and brood-rearing habitats near each ground. Further study will be required to delineate these habitats, but protection of sagebrush draws and riparian meadows should allow sufficient reproduction to sustain sage grouse numbers. A one-quarter-mile buffer is recommended on each side of major streams in the coal lease area to maintain sage grouse nesting and brood-rearing habitat. An estimated 300-400 sage grouse winter in the northern portion of the coal lease area along the southern portion of Separation Creek or along Red Rim. Current data are insufficient to delineate critical sage grouse winter ranges.

There are at least two active golden eagle nests, three active falcon nests, and numerous nests of other raptor species in the coal lease area. Most of these are located along Red Rim or China Butte. According to Lands Unsuitability Criteria #11 and #13, federal lands within a quarter-mile radius of each of these nests shall be considered unsuitable for coal mining. We believe that protection of this type around each American kestrel nest is unreasonable and should be deleted.

Impacts on Important Wildlife Species

If all the coal beds in this lease area were mined, the State of Wyoming could lose approximately 24% of the Baggs antelope herd, 1% of the Baggs mule deer herd, and at least two sage grouse populations. The economic and recreational importance of these species to the State qualifies their critical habitats as unsuitable for coal mining under Criterion #15 of the Lands Unsuitability Criteria. BLM's present delineation of federal lands considered unsuitable for coal mining should adequately protect critical habitat for pronghorn and mule deer if private lands within the delineated areas are not mined. Present delineations may not ensure protection of critical sage grouse habitat.

If coal beds within areas determined to be suitable for coal mining are mined, there will be losses of summer range for pronghorn and mule deer. Successful reclamation will reduce these losses. Mitigation of the loss of summer range by habitat improvements in adjacent areas should be considered.

Mitigation and Stipulations

Although the vegetation types in the critical winter ranges are not unique and can be found outside the proposed coal lease area, the topography of these ranges is unique and essential to the maintenance of populations of resident pronghorn, mule deer, and sage grouse. The varied topography of the Red Rim and China Butte regions provides cover for these species during severe winter storms. Ridges in this area are frequently blown clear of snow, making forage available when it may not be available elsewhere in the region. For these reasons, the habitat on these critical ranges cannot be replaced and mitigation for antelope has not been demonstrated in Wyoming.

All or portions of these critical winter ranges cannot be sacrificed. While the rough and varied terrain of Red Rim ensures that some forage will be available to pronghorn during periods of deep snows and strong winds, the tall vegetation along Separation Creek is needed by these animals during periods with moderate snowfall and little wind when ridges are not blown free of snow. Under severe weather conditions, these pronghorn have concentrated in either the southern or northern portions of the critical winter range, indicating that neither portion can be sacrificed for coal mining without threatening the survival of most of these animals.

The ability to mitigate losses of pronghorn or mule deer critical winter habitat and thereby maintain approximately the present population levels over the long-term has not been demonstrated anywhere in the Southcentral Wyoming coal region. Possible mitigation measures can be divided into three categories; reclamation, improvement of adjoining habitat, and artificial supports.

Successful reclamation of both topography and associated vegetation presently found on the Red Rim and China Butte critical winter ranges for pronghorn and mule deer has not been demonstrated to be feasible. Efforts at reclaiming wildlife habitat after strip mining have been in progress in this region of Wyoming for several years, but, to date, the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality has not released any of these areas as being successfully reclaimed, let alone reclaimed to wildlife habitat. Requiring that this land be reclaimed to pronghorn and mule deer winter habitat would make reclamation of these sites more difficult. If, in the future, the mining industry can demonstrate satisfactory reclamation of winter habitat for these species in areas with similar climates and physical features, then reclassification of federal lands within the Red Rim/China Butte critical winter ranges as suitable for coal mining would be acceptable.

Improvement of habitat near the mining area has been considered as a method of mitigating loss of winter habitat for pronghorn and mule deer. Habitat improvement techniques would include fertilization, irrigation, and modification of livestock grazing. The objective of these techniques would be to stimulate browse production. Each of these techniques, or combinations of the three, would probably increase the total number of kilograms per hectare (pounds per acre) of browse forage. This would not, however, ensure an increase in the available browse for pronghorn or mule deer during crucial winter periods. Snow depth on or around the improvement areas may prevent these game animals from consuming any of the added forage. As already stated, the topography of the Red Rim/China Butte critical ranges is largely responsible for their critical nature. No similar topographic features are available in the region to provide needed cover and windswept slopes during severe winter periods.

The possibility of improving browse production on portions of any critical winter range and maining other portions exists, but, as stated earlier, under different weather conditions, different protions of these winter ranges are utilized. Sacrificing the wrong portion at the wrong time could have the same impact as sacrificing the entire range, regardless of any habitat improvements on remaining portions.

Two methods of artificially maintaining the pronghorn wintering on Red Rim are possible. The first would involve herding these animals to suitable winter ranges. Trapping operations have shown that using helicopters is the only practical method of moving pronghorn in a desired direction. However, trapping operations involve only dozens of pronghorn, nowhere near the problem posed by trying to move and direct 600-1,200 pronghorn. The nearest winter range that might support added animals is southwest along Muddy Creek. This would require herding the pronghorn at least nine miles, and some groups would need to be herded over 20 miles. Herding operations would presumably only be implemented when severe winter conditions concentrated the pronghorn on the Red Rim Winter Range. Herding would require moving these animals through several miles of deep snow at a time when they are already under severe stress or weather conditions might prevent herding until after it was too late to save a large number of pronghorn. The associated mortality and loss of future reproduction could be more damaging than coal mining on the site.

The second potential method of artificially maintaining pronghorn populations is supplemental feeding during severe winters. Supplemental feeding of pronghorn is not a viable substitute for winter habitat, nor is it acceptable mitigation for habitat losses. Numerous problems encountered in the pronghorn feeding operations undertaken by the Game and Fish Department during the winter of 1978-79 would reoccur in any supplemental feeding operations attempted on Red Rim. Since feeding operations would probably not be required every winter, when it became apparent that the winter was severe enough to warrant supplemental feeding, a large portion of the associated mortality and stress on the pronghorn herd would have already occurred. Observations of Red Desert pronghorn during the winter of 1971-72 indicated a significant number of these animals died within two weeks after the first major storm of the season.

A number of problems must be considered in addition to those of quickly organizing, equipping, supplying, and financing the feeding operations. First, it is necessary to locate the surviving pronghorn, which are usually scattered over remaining available critical winter range. This requires aerial surveys that are difficult during much of the winter due to storms and strong winds. The second problem involves gaining access to these scattered groups. Snow vehicles and aircraft would probably be required, and these cannot be used during some storms.

A third obstacle is keeping the pronghorn where the food is. These animals habitually move away from storms until they find an area in which they can survive. Pronghorn have been known to succumb to hypothermia even when in good physiological condition, and without protective cover many die regardless of how much they are fed. If the protective topography along Red Rim were removed or sufficiently altered, the pronghorn would probably not remain there. They would instead move in whichever direction the winds pushed them. Prevailing winter winds are from the west and southwest, so these animals would probably aggregate along fences on the south side of Interstate 80 and the southwest side of Rawlins. Heavy mortality would be expected due to fences, roadkills, and domestic dogs.

Losses of summer range for pronghorn and mule deer might be mitigated by reclamation and habitat improvements on adjoining lands. Feasibility of various mitigation methods will need to be evaluated lease-by-lease in the region.

Federal land which contains a sage grouse strutting ground or is within at least one-quarter mile of a strutting ground should be designated as unsuitable for coal mining. Loss of strutting grounds for sage grouse cannot be mitigated, and techniques for inducing sage grouse to relocate these grounds are still in an experimental stage. If, at a later date, research demonstrates that these strutting grounds can be moved sufficient distances to allow mining, reclassification of that land as acceptable for coal mining should be considered, with the restriction that each strutting ground must be successfully moved offsite before any land within the buffer zone is disturbed by mining activities. Mitigation of nesting and brood-rearing habitat losses may be possible through habitat improvement. Federal lands within a two-mile radius of any strutting ground should be classed as "acceptable pending further study" to allow delineation of sage grouse nesting and brood-rearing habitats.

Falcon and eagle nesting sites probably cannot be mitigated through either reclamation or habitat improvement, but recreation of nesting sites or moving nests may be possible. Stipulations regarding timing of construction may be necessary in order to prevent abandonment of these sites as a result of mining.

Roads and railroads accessing mines will have to be addressed in specific mining plans. These access routes should not cross critical ranges, should lie outside the quarter-mile or mile buffers around active falcon and eagle nests and major streams, and should be either unfenced or fenced in such a manner that wildlife movements are unrestricted.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer these comments in the interest of the wildlife resource.

Sincerely,

/s/ W. Donald Dexter

W. DONALD DEXTER, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
WYOMING GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT

WDD/HBM/mlr
atch.
cc: Game Division
Fish Division
State Planning Coordinator

RED RIM - CHALK BUTTE COAL LEASE





BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 85, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225